

X

KING ALFRED'S COLLEGE
WINCHESTER

To be returned on or before the day marked
below:—

17 DEC 2003

24 JAN 2005

- 2 OCT 2006

WITHDRAWN FROM
THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
WINCHESTER


PLEASE ENTER ON ISSUE SLIP:

AUTHOR STRAUSS

TITLE New life of Jesus. vol. 1.

ACCESSION No. 53695

KA 0131792 X



2 vols

£2.50
mw

Rev'd Father Carmack
Saint Peter's, Cardiff

A small token
of affectionate respect
Arthur Mee

1899-XI-23

A NEW
LIFE OF JESUS.

BY

DAVID FRIEDRICH STRAUSS.

Authorized Translation.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

SECOND EDITION.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;
AND 20, SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1879.

KING ALBERT COLLEGE	
UNIVERSITY OF SURREY	
232.9 STR	53695

LONDON:
 PRINTED BY C. GREEN AND SON,
 178, STRAND.

Inscribed

TO THE MEMORY OF MY DEAR BROTHER,
WILLIAM STRAUSS.*

MY DEAR BROTHER,

OLD as now begins to be my career as an author, the present work is the first, with the exception of two letters, to which I have affixed a dedication. Patrons I never had nor sought for: my instructors—as soon as umbrage was taken at my first work—hastened, in strict conformity with truth, to disavow the cause of offence, namely, the best information that I possessed, as something not of their teaching; and as for the friends and companions of my studies, these I had the mortification of seeing exposed to so much suspicion and annoyance from their merely rumoured intimacy with me (so far as they refused to sacrifice it, as some did, to circumstances), that it became a point of conscientious duty not to expose them to still greater odium by a public memorial of our friendship.

* Towards the close of the year 1862, soon after the present treatise was commenced, the lively interest taken in it by my only brother, a retired manufacturer of Cologne, suggested the thought of inscribing it with his name; and so, as the idea struck me, I hastily committed to paper the following Dedication. A few months later, on the 21st February, 1863, he suddenly fell a victim to his malady, without having ever heard of what I had reserved as a little surprise for him; but his death alters not my desire and my duty to declare publicly the relation in which he stood to myself and to my labours, and so let this Dedication, originally intended as a greeting to the living, remain as an invocation to the dead.

You, dear brother, are independent—exempted by the happy privilege of commercial pursuits from any solicitude as to the favour or displeasure of spiritual or lay superiors; the appearance of your name on the foremost pages of a book of mine can do you no injury. And then not only have you supported your brother by standing faithfully at his side in many a trying crisis—you have also done for the writer in your single person all that could possibly be done by patron, teacher, or friend. You have encouraged, and, what is more, you have understood me; often have you cheered my flagging spirits, and recalled my truant attention to the theme to which it was first devoted; in the composition of this treatise more especially you have been present to my thoughts from the very first, and not a page has been written without an anxious wish to satisfy what I knew to be your own conception of the specific requirements of the age.

And here the dedication of the book coincides with its destination as announced by the title. In dedicating it to my brother, I consider him as a representative of the people, believing that among the German people for whom the book is destined, there are many like himself; many who find their best solace after a day of toil in serious reading; many possessing the exceptional courage to disregard the beaten track of conventional and ecclesiastical routine, and to think for themselves on the most important objects of human concernment; I may add—the still rarer capacity of seeing that there is no security, in Germany at least, for political liberty and progress, until the public mind has been emancipated from superstition, and initiated in a purely human culture.

DEDICATION.

Whether a view of the universe which, disclaiming supernatural aids, leaves man to himself and to the natural order of the world, be one really suited to the people and to the uses of actual life,—whether it be able, not only to keep a man in the right path while prosperous, but to preserve him erect and cheerful in adversity,—you, my dear brother, have had but too many opportunities, especially in the last of the two supposed cases, of ascertaining by experience. You have manfully held out against a tedious illness without any adventitious crutch, relying on that alone which you are able to be and to know as man and member of this divinely teeming world;—under circumstances which might have made the steadiest quail and shaken the strongest faith, you retained your courage and self-possession; not even in moments when hope failed and life was despaired of did you give way to the self-delusion of discounting futurity.

May a serene life's-evening be allotted you after so many severe trials; may this volume satisfy your indulgence, and this dedication not displease you; may it certify to our children and children's children the close spiritual intimacy of their fathers, and the faith in which, without any pretension either to sanctity or saintly beatitude, they at least lived honourably and tranquilly died!

PREFACE.

IN the Preface to the First Edition of my former *Life of Jesus*, written now twenty-nine years ago, I particularly mentioned that the work was intended for theologians; that for others no adequate preparation had been made, so that the book was purposely thrown into a form unsuited for lay comprehension. On the present occasion I write especially for the use of laymen, and have taken particular pains that no single sentence shall be unintelligible to any educated or thoughtful person; whether professional theologians also choose to be among my readers is to me a matter of indifference.

So greatly have things changed during the interval! The general public can now no longer be considered unprepared for inquiries of this nature. Independently of any act of mine, these questions were rashly thrown before the multitude by my bitterest adversaries, the very men who insisted that, in decency, I ought at least to have written in Latin. The loud outcries of these advocates of caution were repeated by persons less scrupulous than myself, and treated in a popular, though to me not very palatable form; until at length the political resuscitation of Germany opened a freer platform for religious as well as other discussions. In consequence of this, many minds have become unsettled in their attachment to old ideas, and roused to independent thought upon religious subjects; while at the same time a variety of preliminary conceptions, which could not be reckoned on as familiar at the time of the publication of my first work, have since become popularly

current. Moreover, it is a mere prejudice of caste to fancy that ability to comprehend these things appertains exclusively to the theologian or man of learning. On the contrary, the essence of the matter is so simple, that every one whose head and heart are in the right place may well rest assured that whatever, after due reflection and the proper use of accessible means, still remains incomprehensible to him, is in itself of very little value.

Again, the interval has made it perfectly clear that professional theologians are precisely those from whom an unprejudiced judgment in these matters is least to be expected. They are in fact interested parties adjudicating their own cause. Any discussion as to the objects of Christian faith as traditionally given, especially as to the Gospel records which are its basis, seems to imply a doubt as to the propriety of the estimation in which they are held as spiritual leaders. Whether rightly or wrongly is immaterial; such they believe to be the case. And to every class or caste its own stability is the first consideration; few indeed among its members would encourage innovations menacing its own safety. And clearly, so soon as Christianity ceases to be thought miraculous, the clergy must cease to seem the miraculously gifted persons they have hitherto represented themselves. Their business will rather be to teach than to confer benedictions, and every one knows that the former office is as difficult and thankless as the latter is remunerative and easy.

In order, then, to make any advance in religious matters, it behoves those theologians who are above professional prejudices and interests to brave the singularity of extending their hand to the thoughtful among the laity. We must address the people, since theologians refuse to listen; as of old the Apostle Paul turned to the Gentiles when the Jews rejected his teaching. And when the better-informed among the people shall have ceased to relish the mental food generally proffered to them by the clergy, the latter will begin to

bethink themselves of providing a better kind of nutriment. But external pressure must be applied to them; just as it had to be resorted to in regard to lawyers of the old school in order to induce them to adopt trial by jury, and other similar reforms. Certain gentlemen will, I know, here insinuate something about theologians of an obsolete class, who now wish to re-appear in the character of spiritual demagogues. Be it so! Mirabeau too was an obsolete nobleman who held out his hand to the people: and truly the act was not barren of result. I, who am no Mirabeau, have a compensation in being able to look back with a clearer conscience to the past, especially to the particular act which caused me to be proscribed by my adopted profession.

This destination for the use of the people is one of the reasons why, instead of a new edition of the old "Life of Jesus," I put forth an entirely new work, in which nothing of the old, except the fundamental ideas, is to be found. Another circumstance, however, led in the same direction. I had long wished to avail myself of the opportunity of a new edition to bring my book to the level of recent inquiries on the subject, and, while defending its general position against objections, to amend and enrich it with the results of later discovery, whether made by myself or others. But I soon found that the former work, whose chief import consisted in its having preceded such discoveries, would be altered—nay, altogether destroyed in its most characteristic peculiarities—by undergoing such a revision; and this were a pity. For in its actual condition it remains an historical memorial of an important era in modern theology; and its plan must for some time to come make it a useful manual for learners. Let the old "Life of Jesus" then continue in its present shape; and should ever a new edition of the now exhausted work seem to be wanted, I have provided by will that it shall be made in accordance with the first, adopting some few corrections from the fourth edition.

In order, then, to incorporate the results of recent investigation, it became necessary to do so, so far as was possible, in the more popular work. And there was no difficulty in doing this, provided learned details were omitted. The omission is a loss in some respects, but in others a gain, inasmuch as in this way the necessity of learned excuses and pretences is excluded. One such pretence is the assurance so often met with in the writings of scientific free-thinkers, that a purely historical interest constitutes the whole gist of their inquiries. With every respect for the word of the learned gentlemen, I beg to affirm that what they tell us is not possible, and would be no credit to them if it were. The motives of a man who writes about the Assyrian Kings or the Egyptian Pharaohs may doubtless be purely historical; but Christianity is so living a power, and the problem as to its origin so rife in important consequences to the immediate present, that the student must be literally stupid whose interest in the determination of such a question can be strictly confined to the historical.

This, however, is indisputable;—he to whom the conceptions, patronised by churches and by the prevalent theology, as to the supernatural character and concatenation of the circumstances of the life of Jesus, have become intolerable, will find his best means of effectual release in historical inquiry. For having adopted the fundamental conviction that everything that happens, or ever happened, happened naturally,—that even the most distinguished of men was still man, and that, consequently, the supernatural colouring in the accounts of early Christianity must be adventitious and unreal, he is induced to expect that the more exactly he can trace the true course of events, the more their natural character will appear; in short, his tendencies lead him towards historical inquiry, though always under the control of strict historical criticism. So far I agree with these gentlemen, and they in the main with me; our great and common aim is not so much to re-

suscitate an obliterated history, as to assist the human mind in emancipating itself from the oppressive thralldom of creeds; and I fully coincide in thinking historical inquiry, together with general philosophical education, to be the best means of effecting this object.

With the pretence of a purely historical interest is moreover connected a reservation, preventing the inquiry from going its full length and reaching its proper goal. It is not asked what Jesus really said or did, but only what the reporters make him say or do; not what a given evangelical narrative portends in itself, but only what the narrator meant or desired under certain circumstances and with certain tendencies peculiar to himself. In this way we have to do with the Evangelists alone, and the Lord is left out of sight: just as constitutional governments throw responsibility on ministries and exempt the crown. This is certainly a prudent provision against fanatical assaults, and it is also quite right that preliminary critical difficulties should be thoroughly sifted; but it is not enough. What we especially want to know is this: is the Gospel history true and reliable as a whole and in its details, or is it not? Only in connection with this vital problem can these preliminary inquiries have a general interest.

In this respect the Gospel criticism of the last twenty years has certainly somewhat run to seed. New hypotheses about the three first Gospels more especially, their sources, objects, authorship, and mutual relation, follow each other so rapidly, and are asserted and attacked with such eagerness, that we almost forget there is anything else to be considered; and the controversy threatens to be so endless, that we begin to despair of ever arriving at a clear understanding as to the main problem, if its solution is really to be deferred until all these matters have been settled.

Luckily this is unnecessary. In regard to the fourth Gospel and its relation to the others, it is certainly most important

to come to a clear understanding before venturing to say a single word upon these subjects; but we may see our way clearly upon many of the most essential points of the Gospel history, without being able to say positively whether Matthew wrote in Hebrew or in Greek; whether he wrote a Gospel, or a mere collection of sayings or discourses; whether Luke had before him both Mark and Matthew, or whether Mark found Luke as well as Matthew ready to his hand. Above all, we are enabled to form a very decided opinion, quite independently of these and similar questions, as to what the Gospel history *is not*. And this negation is for our object, which is prospective, and not merely retrospective and historical, a principal, if not the sole consideration. It consists in this—that in the person and acts of Jesus no supernaturalism shall be suffered to remain; nothing which shall press upon the souls of men with the leaden weight of arbitrary, inscrutable authority. We can, I say, come to a clear issue in regard to this negation, independently of those endless critical questions; for we can plainly perceive this, that no single Gospel, nor all the Gospels together, can claim that degree of historical reliability which would be required in order to make us debase our reason to the point of believing miracles.

The affirmative counterpart to this negation is twofold: first, the notion to be entertained as to the person, objects, and true history of Jesus; secondly, the mode in which the unhistorical portion of the narrative about him originated. In order to be able to give a satisfactory answer to these questions, it is doubtless necessary to know what part of the description of Christ, given by each of the Evangelists, is his own gratuitous addition, and whence he derived it. This again cannot be known until the aims and means, the external as well as internal conditions of their literary activity, have been thoroughly investigated. This is far more than has been yet attained; still it is allowable, nay desirable, that from time to time a census should be taken of results,

separating what has been established as certain or probable, from doubtful or improbable conjecture. The attention of all parties is thus recalled to the main issue; and such reminders, by concentrating the thoughts, are always advantageous to science.

As to myself, I adhere to my original position, while at the same time endeavouring to avail myself of the results of later investigations. For this end I have tried to learn from all who, since the first appearance of my "Life of Jesus," have occupied a conspicuous place in criticism on the subject; and no one will be able to reproach me with the sin of literary "Pilatism,"—the term given by the Swiss to Godsched's obstinate insistence on every word he had once written. To Baur and his followers I owe the greater part of the new information I have gained; and if unable to agree with all their results, I heartily sympathise with the method and tone of their inquiries; while on the other hand, as regards the party opposed to them, though availing myself of particular results, I consider, as I always did, their general aim and mode of proceeding mistaken. The former class of critics will, I hope, not think it disrespectful, if, in a work like the present, I treat many of the matters forming the subject of their inquiries with indifference: as to the others, I know very well what sort of reception I have to expect, and stand prepared for every sort of demonstration of ill-will, from supercilious silence and scornful disparagement, down to accusations of blasphemy and sacrilege. And the book being dedicated to the German people, I already foresee the counter protestations which will be raised in the name of the German people, by those who have assuredly no authority to speak on their behalf.

I look upon the German people as the people of the Reformation; of the Reformation considered not as a transaction already finished in the past, but as a work to be carried on and progressively accomplished in the future. To this progressive

accomplishment, the culture of the present age tends as surely and unmistakeably as that of four centuries ago. We behold a crisis accompanied now as then by the painful conviction that, though Christianity be in the main indispensable, a part of what passes under its name has become absolutely intolerable. The old Reformation had an advantage in this, that what then appeared intolerable, appertained wholly to the doctrines and practice of the Church, while the Bible, and an ecclesiastical discipline simplified according to its dictates, provided what seemed a satisfactory substitute. The operation of sifting and separation was easy; and the Bible continuing an unquestioned treasure of revelation and salvation to the people, the crisis, though violent, was not dangerous. Now, on the contrary, that which then remained as the stay of Protestants, the Bible itself, with its history and its teaching, is called in question; the sifting process has now to be applied to its own pages, and we have to distinguish between that part of it which is true and valid for all time, and that which, depending on casual and temporary circumstances, has now become useless or pernicious. And even that which now remains valid and obligatory for ourselves is no longer so considered because it is supernaturally revealed to us in the Bible, but because it is seen to be true in itself, because reason and experience shew it to be imperishably established in the laws and constitution of our nature.

Indispensable, but also imperishable, remains that part of Christianity, by which it raised human nature above the sensual religion of Greece on one hand, and Jewish legalism on the other; on one side, that is, the belief that the world is governed by a spiritual and moral Power; on the other, the perception that the service of such a Being can only be like himself, namely, a moral and spiritual one, a worship of the disposition and the heart. We can indeed scarcely contemplate the latter element as constituting a continuing remnant among us of the old Christianity; since in a real and

true sense it has never yet been generally established. Even the Protestant Christianity of the day remains attached to outward acts, which, though in themselves not more valuable than the ceremonies of the Jews, are yet esteemed essential to salvation. And if we inquire how such heterogeneous elements could have mingled with the religion of Jesus, and have been retained in it, we shall find the cause to be the very same as that which to us constitutes the chief offence of all ancient religion, namely, belief in the miraculous. So long as Christianity is considered as something given from without, its Author as literally heaven-descended, the Church as a machinery for procuring the expiation of human offences through his blood, Christianity, though claiming to be the religion of the Spirit, must remain unspiritual, and in fact Jewish. Only when it is seen that in Christianity man did but become more deeply conscious of his own true nature, that Jesus was the individual in whom this deeper consciousness first became a supreme all-pervading influence, that redemption means but the advent of such a disposition and its inward adoption as our very life-blood, then only is Christianity really and thoroughly understood.

There exists in our time a vague presentiment that this, and this alone, is the true and abiding essence of Christianity, that all else is fume and husk, perishable and half perished already. It is a truth often divined by simple minds in the lower classes of society, and as often, with much else that is good and beautiful, a secret to the high and mighty. Indeed, the close association in which the two component parts of Christianity are placed in the sacred writings, expose many a mind to the risk of losing the essence with the husk, or at least to an irritating struggle, and dangerous perplexity between unbelief and morbid faith, between fanaticism and the laxity of indifferentism. To come to the aid of this helpless bewilderment is the duty of every one who feels the ability to do so. But the only mode of doing so is to mark out

clearly the line separating the abiding elements of Christianity—the genuine and saving truths—from the products of transient opinion. The line so drawn becomes a rent cleaving through the centre of the sacred writings, which is as much as to say through the heart of many an excellent Christian. Yet the rending of the heart has been esteemed an act of meritorious devotion; and this time it may be got over, at the expense of a slight headache and a little application of the reason. He to whom it has once occurred that man and all that belongs to him, religion not excepted, is historically developed, must see that within this development there can be no absolute perfection; he must acknowledge that the conceptions put forth under very unfavourable circumstances, in the religious writings of more than fifteen centuries ago, cannot now be taken as literally identical with our own, and that in order to make them presently available a separation of essentials from accessories is indispensable.

To effect this separation is now the proper task of Protestantism, and of the German people as leaders and pioneers of Protestantism. To this the efforts now made here and there in Germany in the direction of freer forms of church discipline can only be considered as preliminary. Considered in this light, they are matter of congratulation; but to suppose that nothing more remains to be done were a fatal error. Folly or knavery lurks in the pretence now circulated, that not dogma, or the contest of rationalism with supernaturalism, but only the life of the Church, is the proper business of our time. For church government is but the vehicle or form of a certain Christian substance: in order to know the aptest form, you must consider well the character of your Christianity, whether it be something natural or supernatural; for a supernatural religion of mysteries and sacramental graces necessarily brings with it an order of priests elevated above the congregation. *He who would banish priests from the Church must first banish miracles from religion.*

In calling upon the German nation to enter upon this enterprise, I by no means withdraw them from politics, but only indicate the safest and most effectual way of solving the political problem. For as the Reformation, engendered out of the peculiar characteristics of the German nation, has set its stamp upon them for all time, so it is certain that no national enterprise can have a chance of success which is unconnected with the Reformation,—which does not essentially grow out of their intellectual and moral culture. We Germans can be politically free only in proportion as we have made ourselves spiritually, morally, and religiously free. And what is it which ever disconcerts the efforts of our people to effect a united Germany, which makes the separation of north and south, untoward enough in itself, into a dangerous and festering ulcer, but the difference of Confessions,—the unhappy circumstance that the progress of the Reformation was violently arrested in the midst of its career, or rather robbed of the fruits of a success which was already on the point of accomplishment? And yet both sides have long been fully aware that as matters now stand neither can possibly succeed in winning over the other; that the sole possibility of re-union consists in the discovery of a third position elevated above both the rival parties. This higher position the German nation can never reach until it be initiated into the internal essence of religion, and emancipated from those external accessories which form the root of confessional distinctions. The so-called German Catholicism on one side, on the other the Protestant associations of “*Lichtfreunde*,”*—already beginning to unite with one another in free religious communities,—are praiseworthy efforts tending to this end: a speculative contribution to this practical object will, it is hoped, be found in the present work.

In this view it offers the hand of fellowship to the French

* *Friends of Light.*

one of Renan. Whatever complaints may be urged against this now famous work, it is certain that a book which on its first issue was condemned by I know not how many Bishops, and by the Roman Court itself, must necessarily be a work of merit. It has its faults, but only one fundamental error; this I trust its gifted author will recognise, and rectify his work accordingly. Whatever else may seem to us as faults are partly what in its native country will be esteemed as merits contributing to its circulation; while, on the contrary, several peculiarities by which the author of the present work hopes to earn the approbation of his own countrymen will on the other side of the Rhine cause displeasure or weariness. I joyfully hailed the work of Renan on its appearance, when my own was nearly completed, as the sign of a generally felt want; on closer acquaintance I accept it respectfully, and though by no means tempted by its example to alter my own plan, I may say that all I wish is to have written a book as suitable for Germany as Renan's is for France.

THE AUTHOR.

Heilbronn, January, 1864.

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

IF the translator avails himself of the usual privilege of adding a word on his own account, it can only be for the purpose of summarily reiterating what is said by the author, both in his preface and elsewhere, as to the essential nature of Christianity. For if this be distinctly understood, if it be clearly seen to consist in little, if anything, more than intrinsic goodness—goodness not enforced artificially from without, but flowing naturally from a pure heart and disposition replete with love to God and man—then there is an end to perplexity and anxiety about extrinsic, unessential, and doubtful accessories, about metaphysical niceties of creed, miraculous narratives, and ecclesiastical mystifications. If, as once said by high authority, it be the mission of English men and women to “teach all nations,” surely it ought to be one of their first duties to teach themselves, and especially to gain correct notions as to the nature of the religion which they would impart to others.

Freedom, Christianity, Mythology, are, after all, but ill understood in England, and the prevalent errors about them may be traced to the same cause. The cause is the mistaking the external for the internal. If freedom be thought to consist in external adjustments or protestations rather than in the quality and culture of the soul; if mythology, instead of being

investigated as a problem nearly and deeply affecting us, be treated as a mere series of fanciful stories with which, except in the way of amusement, we are personally unconcerned,—no wonder that the popular view of Christianity also should be superficial and external, making it rather a mechanical contrivance for conferring salvation, than a process of inward amendment, spirituality, and purity. May this publication contribute to the effusion of clearer ideas on these important subjects!

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

DEDICATION.

Author's Preface.

SEC.	PAGE
INTRODUCTION—PART I.	
1. ON THE IDEA OF A LIFE OF JESUS	1— 46
2. Various Forms of the Attempt to write a Life of Jesus. Hess	5
3. Herder	8
4. Paulus	13
5. Schleiermacher	19
6. Hase	25
7. Strauss	33
8. Reaction and Compromise—Neander, Ebrard, Weisse, Ewald. Recent additional Efforts—Keim, Renan . .	36
INTRODUCTION—PART II. THE GOSPEL SOURCES OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.	
DIV. I. EXTERNAL TESTIMONIES AS TO THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF THE GOSPELS	
9. General Observations	47—101
10. The most Ancient Testimonies to the Three First Gospels	56
11. Additional Evidence for the Three First Gospels . .	65
12. Evidence for the Gospel of John	77
13. Recognition and Rejection of the Gospel of John . .	86
DIV. II. THE GOSPELS VIEWED ACCORDING TO THEIR INTERNAL CHARACTERISTICS, AND THEIR RELATION TO EACH OTHER	
14. Different Hypotheses as to the Relation of the Three First Gospels—Lessing, Eichhorn, Hug, Griesbach, Gieseler, Schleiermacher	101—194
15. The Gospel of John : Bretschneider, Schleiermacher	101
16. Further Treatises about the Three First Gospels, and their Relation to the Fourth : Schultz, Sieffert, Schnecken- burger; my own Critical Discussion of the Life of Jesus	115
17. Attempts to discover an Authentic and Unauthentic Element in the Fourth Gospel: Weisse, Schweitzer, Renan	121
	127

SEC.	PAGE
18. Baur's Examination of the Gospel of John continued .	141
19. Retrospective View of the Three First Gospels: Matthew	150
20. The Gospel of Luke	157
21. The Gospel of Mark	169
22. Comparative Estimate of the Four Gospels .	183
CONSIDERATIONS PREPARATORY TO THE FOLLOWING INVESTIGATION	
	194—218
23. Retrospect	194
24. The Idea of Miracle	195
25. The Idea of Myth	201
26. Plan of the Work	214

FIRST BOOK.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF THE LIFE OF JESUS .	221—440
27. Prefatory Remarks	221
28. Development of Judaism	225
29. Development of Greco-Roman Cultivation . .	241
30. The Baptist	252
31. Jesus. His Extraction	258
32. Education. Relation to John the Baptist .	261
33. Religious Consciousness, undiscoverable in Fourth Gospel	268
34. Religious Consciousness, according to Three First Gospels	276
35. His Relation to the Mosaic Law	283
36. His Position towards the Non-Israelites . .	296
37. His Relation to the Idea of the Messiah . .	302
38. The Teaching and the Suffering Messiah . .	313
39. Second Advent of the Messiah	322
40. Theatre and Duration of his Public Ministry .	333
41. His Mode of Teaching	346
42. His Miracles	360
43. His Disciples	370
44. His Journey to Jerusalem	381
45. His Last Supper, Arrest, and Crucifixion . .	387
46. His Resurrection. Gospel Accounts unsatisfactory .	396
47. His Resurrection not a Natural Revival . .	408
48. His Appearance to the Apostle Paul . . .	412
49. Origin of the Belief in his Resurrection . .	420
50. Time and Place of the Apostolic Visions . .	429

INTRODUCTION.

ON THE IDEA OF A LIFE OF JESUS.

GOSPEL SOURCES AND CHARACTERISTICS.

INTRODUCTION.

1. ON THE IDEA OF A LIFE OF JESUS.

AT a comparatively early day we already meet with the term "Life of Jesus," and with writings passing under this or a similar title; nevertheless, what we now understand by this phrase is an idea emphatically modern.

The Church, whether Protestant or Catholic, possessed a life of Christ only in the form of its two doctrines, that of Christ's person, and that relating to his work or office; the first explaining what he is and was as incarnate Son of God, in order to be enabled to do what was required for the restoration of fallen man; the other detailing the particulars of what, in this capacity, he did and still does for us. Such particulars, so far as belonging to the past and to his earthly career, were certainly a part of his life, or, if you will, his whole life was a superhuman redeeming activity; still, even when so understood and related, it appears under an aspect quite different from that in which the circumstances of a human life are usually considered for the purposes of biography. Such, however, so long as Church theology prevailed, was the view adopted; accounts of the Redeemer's life were only paraphrases or combinations of Scripture passages confirmatory or illustrative of Church dogma,—not what we now understand by a life or history of Jesus.

The hero of a biography, according to modern conceptions, should be entirely and clearly human. A personage half human, half divine, may figure plausibly enough in poetry and fable, but is never at the present day seriously

chosen as the subject of historical narrative. The human hero of a biography is a being partly natural, partly spiritual; one, whose lower impulses and selfish aims ought in duty to be held in subordination to the universal law of reason, not one whose tendencies are already and necessarily so controlled in consequence of a union of humanity and divinity. Hesitation and failure, struggles between the senses and the reason, between selfish and general aims, are incidental to every human life; and although the disturbance arising from this inward warfare may vary infinitely in degree, from the wildest tumult of the passions to the most insignificant interruption of their repose, still its absolute exclusion, as supposed in the Church doctrine as to the sinlessness of Christ, must be fatal to any true conception of humanity.

Moreover, even the most highly gifted of human individuals is always influenced by the conditions of the particular circle in which he lives and moves. He belongs to a special family, age, and nation; his soul, however independent and self-centred, is fed on the one hand, and on the other limited by the nature and degree of the culture so derived; his aims are swayed by surrounding circumstances, and are hence exposed not only to obstructions in their execution, but also to indefinite modifications and improvements resulting from maturer experience. But the divinely begotten Son or incarnate Word of traditional belief is under no such restriction. His original endowment needs no human teaching, being entirely and absolutely independent of limiting conditions of family or nation; his aims, or rather the single aim to fulfil which he is sent into the world, is pre-appointed from eternity, and carried out with inevitable persistency and certainty, apart from any of the usual influences of social life, or even of the laws of nature.

In all biographies, influences of the above kind are a matter of course. The hero is a finite individual, whose force is limited by other surrounding forces acting according to

natural laws. The alternate play of such forces is the proper subject of history, whose fundamental law is that of causality; in virtue of which every effect is assumed to have a natural and assignable motive; the introduction of a heterogeneous supernatural initiative into the wheel-work inevitably breaks its continuity, and makes history impossible.

In all these respects the Church conception of Christ is irreconcilably at variance with the idea of history in general and that of biography in particular. In the attempt to give to that conception a biographical form, we see at once that form and matter refuse to coalesce. The Christ of the Church is no subject for biographical narrative, and the idea of making it one is not only modern but self-contradictory. The two sides of which it consists—dogma and history—were developed separately, the attempt to combine them being first made in the eighteenth century. A tendency to blend incongruities is characteristic of an age of transition. Men wished to retain the Christ of the Church, but felt that they could do so only by adapting to the prescribed outline the familiar forms of actual life; and thus the discordant elements, human and divine, the matter and the mode of treatment, became virtually decomposed, betraying their intrinsic disharmony in the vain effort to unite them.

And so the conception of a life of Christ was ominous of coming change. It anticipated the broad results of modern theological development. It lay as a snare in the path of the latter, prognosticating in its special incompatibilities the general disruption of traditional belief. It was as a pit into which theology was inevitably destined to fall and to become extinguished. When the biography was seriously taken up, the fate of the theological conception was sealed; if the latter was to survive, the biography should never have been attempted. But the attempt was inevitable. If antiquity held it becoming to treat nothing human as alien to humanity,

the watchword of modern times is to regard everything as alien and irrelevant which is not natural and human. The significance of Christ in relation to modern times could only be substantiated by making his career biographically intelligible, and by treating his life as a pragmatistical sequence of events on the same footing as that of other illustrious men.

Of the danger inseparable from such a mode of treating the subject there was no presentiment at first. It was thought to be a merely trifling concession, involving no change in regard to essentials. And then there was comfort in the assurance that whatever became of dogmatical Christology, the Christ of the New Testament was at all events safe. It was imagined that the latter was quite natural and human if rightly interpreted and understood. But what if this were not the case; if the Christ of the New Testament, though in some respects dissimilar, substantially agreed with the theological or dogmatical conception in its miraculous representations of his nature and acts? The New Testament is the only existing source of all that we particularly know about Jesus. If in this sole documentary authority he appears under a form incompatible with biography, then, a biography being required at our hands, it becomes imperatively necessary that the authority should be proved, *i. e.* tried and measured by the general standard of human probabilities. And thus, as the dogmatic treatment of the Life of Jesus inevitably passed into the pragmatistical, so the pragmatistical necessarily advanced a stage onward to the critical. Only when this latter operation had been completed by a full and unsparing investigation into the credibility of the Gospel accounts, could the idea of a pragmatistical biography be honestly entertained; and even then only within very unpretentious and modest limits, if it turned out that the Gospel materials, when critically tested, dwindled under the process down to a faint and hesitating outline.

2. VARIOUS FORMS OF THE ATTEMPT TO WRITE A * LIFE OF JESUS. HESS.

The labours now for more than a hundred years successively directed to the construction of Lives of Jesus, form a series of efforts to bring the two conflicting elements of the idea above alluded to into harmony. But the issue of these attempts, each more unfortunate than the other, only proves the impossibility of such a union, and the consequent necessity of a critical sifting of the documents. It is impossible here to follow step by step this process of development or rather decomposition ; yet it is necessary to note its principal stages as indicated in certain eminently distinguished efforts of the kind, especially as the operation will tend to exhibit the reasons and necessary connection of my former work with the present.

One of the earliest, and if long continued popularity may warrant the saying so, one of the happiest attempts to give to the evangelical narrative a biographical form, was that of J. J. Hess of Zurich. First published in 1768, it has since re-appeared in various editions down to the present century, and was a favourite book with our sires. Hess cherished the belief that, with a slight measure of concession on the part of orthodoxy, the Gospel narrative might be made to harmonise admirably with the requisitions of biography. His fundamental theory is that of supernaturalism ; the divine element of the Gospels is fully recognised ; the entrance of Jesus into the world, his exit, his nature, are all superhuman ; of his miracles none are curtailed. But Hess having in his preface declared his purpose to construct, not a mere work of religious edification or antiquarianism, but a history of the most instructive and pleasing kind, imagines that without detracting from the divine character of Christ, it remains still within his power to represent him as eminently human, to treat his

history as an intelligible series of events explicable from physical and moral causes. He thinks the same mode of treatment applicable even to the miracles; since we have to consider not merely their supernatural cause, but also the moral motives for working them; their true worth consisting not merely in their extraordinary or inexplicable nature, but quite as much in their moral characteristics, as manifesting divine goodness and benevolence.

It also marks the spirit of the age which witnessed the first efforts of our modern poetical literature, that in addition to the moral characteristics of the Gospel narrative, attention was called to its æsthetic beauty and mastery over the feelings. Hess, for instance, considers the miracles of the infancy and those of the public life of Jesus, as having equal claims to historical credibility; but he particularly dwells on the appropriateness of the virgin birth as in itself, independently of its historic truth, the most dignified mode of introducing the Son of God into the world; adding that no one possessing sense and taste can read the account of the angelic vision to the Bethlehemite shepherds without recognising this mode of announcement as one of especial suitability and surpassing beauty.

It is impossible, even for the most orthodox, to avoid applying a certain amount of critical discrimination to the Gospels, since we have before us four different lives of Jesus, each to a certain extent parallel to the other, yet often with varying and differently arranged circumstances; and again, sometimes containing conflicting statements, many of which are individually peculiar to the several writers. In such cases Hess naturally tries to be as conservative as possible; he throws into forced union the inconsistent accounts of the infancy given by Matthew and Luke, distinguishes the nobleman of Capernaum in John from the centurion in Matthew, the supper of the washing of the feet from that of the institution of the Eucharist: but then he is unable to

admit two cleansings of the temple, although the one narrated by John occurs at the first visit to Jerusalem, that of the other Evangelists at the last and only visit. There he naively makes John yield the preference to Matthew, though without the least suspicion as to the authenticity of either narrative.

Yet, however decided the author's belief in the miraculous, we may here and there observe a passage in some unobtrusive corner in which his faith seems tainted with rationalism. To the star of the wise men, he says, he would rather give the general name of meteor; it is not, however, generality which he really has in view, but rather the greater probability attained by the narrative of the star's "going before" and "standing over" the house, by placing it in a lower region of the air. But it is especially in his view of Satan and the devil in which Hess betrays rationalistic influences. In his account of the temptation he begins by speaking of the "tempter," omitting any particular description of his person,* only in the second act of the drama suddenly introducing the name Satan. But since the object ascribed to the "tempter" is that of discovering whether Jesus was really the Son of God, as announced at his baptism—a fact which, according to the Bible, Satan must know, and only a human opponent, such as a Pharisee, could doubt—one readily sees how Hess in this instance involuntarily betrays a rationalistic leaning.

To this leaning he abandons himself entirely in his statements as to demoniacal possession. He professes to give no opinion as to the cause of this anomalous condition, confining himself to a careful description of the symptoms. It seems to him of comparatively little moment whether these were originated naturally or preternaturally, because in either case the miracle is equally great, nor can any blame attach to the Evangelists, who make no pretension to be natural

* In the Tübingen Ed., 1779.

philosophers, if they recount these phenomena as they received them from popular belief. Hess, therefore, always speaks of possession as a malady commonly ascribed to the influence of bad spirits; as to the case of Mary Magdalen, out of whom seven devils are said to have been cast, we can here, he says, form no clear conception as to the nature of the malady, possibly because it consisted in a combination of many several disorders of the kind usually ascribed to the influence of evil spirits. Now certainly such influences are irreconcilable with that natural connection of cause and effect which, for the purposes of history and biography, must needs be assumed; but scepticism was only in its infancy, suggesting as yet no misgiving as to how far a direct rivalry and collision with the powers of darkness formed an essential ingredient of the character of Christ as given in the Church estimate or that of the New Testament. Moreover, no biography can properly deal with the circumstances of a hero whose thoughts and plans transcend the beginnings of the world; Hess, therefore, while allowing pretensions of this nature, as claimed by the Jesus of the fourth Gospel, to subsist in the form of Scripture paraphrase, prefers, when speaking in his own person, to insist on the opposed Socinian theory of a subsequent exaltation of Jesus on account of his earthly merits; thus clearly evincing a rationalistic tendency which would necessarily spread farther, eventually absorbing the entire circumstances of the Life of Jesus.

3. HERDER.

The writings of Herder mark a considerable advance in the development we are here tracing. His treatises on the "Redeemer of Mankind as represented by the Three First Gospels" (A.D. 1796), and on "The Son of God, the Saviour of the World, according to John's Gospel" (1797), here claim notice. The effects of the formidable attack made on

the Bible and Christianity in the Wolfenbüttel Fragments, had been deeply felt; and Lessing's disquisitions on the subject had already placed the whole controversy on a higher footing. A mind like Herder's saw easily that the divine character of Jesus could no longer be maintained on the former basis of implicit belief in the truth of the Gospel narrative; but his dealings with these subjects were too fugitive to allow of his attaining a new satisfactory position in regard to them; the tendency to distinguish accurately was too much overpowered in his mind by the love of combination, so that he amused himself in a semi-obscure region, teeming indeed with fertile germs of better knowledge, which it remained the task of posterity to sift and to develop.

Hess had treated the evidence of miracles as necessary in regard to a part, though only a part, of the doctrine of Jesus. Some things, he thought, were cognisable by the light of reason, as carrying their own evidence, such as our obligation to virtue and our belief in its blissful results; whereas accounts of a supernatural dispensation of God for the accomplishment of salvation could only be accredited by supernatural means. Herder went farther; for him the rational and moral part of the teaching and life of Jesus was the sole essential element: Jesus was the God-man, as representing the fullest and fairest aspect of humanity; the redeeming power of his acts and sufferings consisted in the disinterested absoluteness with which he sacrificed his own life to the effort to plant a true humanity enduringly among mankind. Only what the doctrine, character, and acts of Jesus contribute to the benefit of man is, in Herder's estimate, the Gospel quintessence contained in the Gospels; miracles may have at the time been a means of recommending his person and mission to the ignorant Jewish multitude, as well as of encouragement to himself; but in this their utility is exhausted; we have nothing more to do with them; we cannot test their reality, and by trying to base the Christian religion

upon them we involve ourselves in endless difficulty. Were the miracles ever so true, repeats Herder after Lessing, still for us they are only stories of miracles ; to square them with our philosophy, to explain them from our own notions, to invent physical hypotheses to account for them, were a vain undertaking, especially considering that our conception of a miracle differs from that of earlier times. We have first artificially to place ourselves among the very different notions of the contemporaries of the teacher, whose object was to establish a higher kingdom or culture by eradicating those notions. They may be pardoned if, deeply imbued with Jewish prejudice, they thought such external aids to faith indispensable ; we, on the contrary, being enabled by the higher views derived from Jesus to obtain a more comprehensive survey of the nature of his work, are inexcusable if, in addition to the moral evidences of Christianity, we look for further proofs of its excellence. Is it necessary, asks Herder, that fire should have fallen from heaven two thousand years ago in order to enable us to see the light of the sun at this day ? Must the laws of nature have been arrested in order to convince us now of the intrinsic truth, beauty, and necessity of Christ's moral kingdom ? Let us rather thank God that this kingdom exists, and, instead of brooding over miracles, try to comprehend its true nature ; its nature itself must be its evidence to our minds, else all the miracles and prophecies ever wrought or accomplished are for us unsaid, unwrought, unprofitable.

If we further ask how Herder applied these principles to particular narratives in the Gospels, we seek in vain for any special utterances on the subject ; a few passages only afford an opportunity of guessing his true meaning. In regard to the proceedings with the possessed, for instance the legionary devils who wanted to be cast into the herd of swine, Herder tells us that Jesus, in order to reclaim the maniac, spoke to him in his own language ; the transfiguration is a vision of

the Apostles in the excited mental condition preceding the final and fatal resolve; the miracle at the baptism is a mere natural event, a softly beaming radiance from the clouds accompanied by a low muttering of thunder, which Jesus as well as the Baptist recognised as an expression of divine approval of his enterprise.

In these instances the natural explanation of miracle is suggested; elsewhere Herder tends to the symbolical. He says, Jesus performed miracles; he, elevated as he was above contemporary weaknesses, nevertheless accommodated himself to those weaknesses; but the miracles he performed were of the noblest kind; he came to the rescue of sick, erring, alienated humanity, so that the corporeal benefits which he conferred remain as typical reflections of his kindly nature, of his lofty and progressive purpose. Such is the aspect under which, to Herder's fine observation, appear more especially the miracles of the fourth Gospel; they are there not for their own sake, but as symbols of the continued miracle through which the Saviour exercises a present and constant influence over humanity. The miracle of Cana, for instance, is a type of the loftier, mightier agency distinguishing Jesus from the Baptist; the gifts and offices of the two prophets standing to one another in the same relation as purifying water to gladdening wine. So also, according to Herder, the fourth Evangelist recounts at such length the raising of Lazarus, less for the sake of the miracle as such than for its value as an illustration of the truth, that Christ is the resurrection and the life,—and also for its importance as an element of the final catastrophe, introducing the history of Christ's own revival from the dead. From this view, in which the Johannine miracles appear as illustrative symbols, it evidently requires but a slight advance to reject entirely the historical credibility of the fourth Gospel, and to treat its miraculous narratives as mere allegorical fictions; but this step Herder does not and cannot take, because a conviction of the authen-

ticity of the fourth Gospel especially is with him fundamental, and because the natural explanation of miracles appears to him a less dangerous expedient.

This latter resource he very emphatically applies to the crowning miracle of the resurrection. The answer which he gives to the question of Reimarus, Why did not the revived Jesus shew himself to his enemies as well as his friends?—namely, that he did not wish to be seized, bound, ill treated, and crucified a second time—already betrays a conception of the resurrection very different from that of the Church and of the Gospels. He, indeed, rejects the idea of the resurrection having been aided by human means; yet he lays great stress on the circumstance, assumed by him as certain, that the feet were not nailed to the cross like the hands; that the body of the resuscitated Saviour required nourishment, and was perceptible to touch, this certainly implying no phantom which could pass through closed doors. The resurrection is thus seemingly changed from a miraculous act of divine power into a natural event; but Herder reminds us that neither in the natural nor the moral order of things can anything occur independently of Almighty power; that even to suppose a mere case of suspended animation were no hindrance to our faith, which might boldly answer, Why distress myself about the means employed by God in restoring life? Enough that he returned and shewed himself to his friends; the story is truly told and is no fable or illusion. But then, we must here ask, what, after all, remains as the real history of the resurrection? Evidently in Herder's view something quite different from that of the Evangelists; for here an essential part of the existing narrative is sacrificed to the interests of historical credibility, which tolerates no miraculous interruptions of the order of natural events.

4. PAULUS.

In Herder's profound and comprehensive mind, the germs of two very different modes of interpreting the miraculous elements in the life of Jesus—namely, the natural, and the mythical or symbolical—were amicably united and associated. In conformity with the prevalent tone of contemporary culture, the coarser of the two methods was first developed. At the close of the last and commencement of the present century there appeared numerous writings adopting the natural explanation; the classical work based on this theory is, however, the "Gospel Commentary" of Dr. Paulus, and the subsequently issued compendium of it entitled "*Leben Jesu*."*

For Paulus as well as for Herder the main point in Jesus is his moral superiority, his genuine humanity, and his agency in implanting this character among mankind. A glimpse of the cordial benevolence characteristic of Jesus, Paulus says, on occasion of the miracle of Cana, is far more valuable and impressive than the amazement excited by fancied demonstrations of superhuman power over nature. Herder had already given up miracles considered as anything more than unexpected results of Providential coincidences, particularly disclaiming their evidential force in establishing the truth of Christianity; Paulus, adopting the same principle from Spinoza's theologico-political treatise and the Kantian philosophy, expresses it in a still more decided and emphatic form. That no event can be considered historically credible which is not to be explained according to the laws of causation,—that it is an error to affect to recognise divine power, wisdom, and goodness in interruptions of the law of nature rather than its unbroken continuity,—that even the most astounding

* The Commentary appeared A.D. 1800-1804. The *Leben Jesu* in 1828.

ostensible changes in nature could avail nothing in supporting a spiritual truth or proving or disproving a religious doctrine; these are axioms in whose recognition and application the Commentary of Paulus stands far above not only many contemporary, but even much more recent works of a similar kind.

It is curious to see how an inquirer armed with these fundamental axioms deals with writings which, like the Gospels as hitherto universally understood, are composed on an entirely contradictory hypothesis; works brimful of miracle and supernaturalism, and treating these very anomalies as the most conclusive evidence of the exalted dignity of Jesus and of the truth of his teaching. To reject them as unhistorical and fabulous was impossible for one who, with the rationalistic school generally, acquiesced in the common belief as to the proximity of the writers to the time and place of the occurrences. According to Paulus, the materials of Matthew's Gospel were collected in Galilee, within ten or twelve years after the death of Jesus; Luke, when with St. Paul in Jerusalem and Cæsarea, may have had personal interviews with the mother of Jesus, and obtained from her the narrative of the infancy which he prefixes to his Gospel; the Gospel of St. John, if not actually written by the Apostle, was composed by one of his disciples from the instructions, and probably the written memoranda of his master. On the supposition of the accuracy of this view of the origin of the Gospels, their narratives must be in some sort correct; while, on the other hand, assuming the truth of the theory as to the inadmissibility of miracles, there must necessarily be something wrong in them;—how is the contradiction to be reconciled?

In the first place, says Paulus, we must recollect that many of the accounts commonly deemed miraculous are really not so when candidly considered; and he thinks he perceives that precisely in the most incredible stories, the marvel is

not really in the text, but is only an interpolation of the interpreter. If the Evangelists say that Jesus walked upon the sea, that is, on the bank above the water level, why hold them responsible for the vulgar construction of walking on the sea itself? They might possibly have expressed themselves with greater clearness; but which is the more likely, an inaccurate expression on the part of a writer, or a real departure from the order of nature? So in the story of feeding the five thousand, the Evangelists say nothing as to how it was done, since Jesus had but a few loaves and fishes. The common supposition is that the food grew under the hands of Jesus; this, however, is gratuitous, and another may have an equal right to surmise that, prompted by the example of Jesus, other persons among the multitude who were provided with supplies, contributed to the abundance of the banquet so as to satisfy all. That this interpretation is the more correct, as well as the more natural one, appears from the fact that the Evangelists* say nothing of the astonishment which would necessarily be excited by so wonderful a multiplication of the food. The critical historian has no right to make additions to his original, unless it be something which might naturally have been omitted as self-evident: but nothing can be thought self-evident except that which is natural; a supernatural interposition, if intended, would have been expressly mentioned. To this, however, it must be replied, that in a narrative like that of the Gospels, whose main subject is miracle, we are entitled to assume a preternatural cause of particular occurrences related as parts of the subject, and it is precisely because the amazement of the witnesses might be readily assumed, that the writer does not think it necessary to mention it.

But Paulus does not venture to apply this explanation to

* The fourth Evangelist (vi. 14) certainly does report astonishment on the part of the witnesses, but that he at least attributes no great significance to such astonishment appears from ch. ii. 23, 24.—*Translator*.

the miracles generally. He admits that in many cases the parties concerned imagined they witnessed a miracle, and that the Gospel writer intended to relate one, where the historian can admit nothing but a natural event. It is indisputable, for instance, that the Evangelists speak of mad and epileptic persons as if they were possessed; but that is the construction put by them on the facts, which we must carefully distinguish from the facts themselves. The mode in which they relate the healing of these sick persons, mingles with the fact their own individual judgment as to the cause of the malady, and hence the alleged casting out of evil spirits; whereas we have to interpret the healing of this kind of sickness from psychological considerations, founded on the prevalent Jewish opinion, that evil spirits must yield to prophets, and especially to the Messiah. Paulus thinks, too, that the other cures performed by Jesus may be understood as natural events, when we eliminate the judgments mixed up with the narratives by the Evangelists. For they themselves admit the work of healing to have been no mere magical act with Jesus, but a matter of time and trouble; if, for instance, those cures where there was no bed to carry were made occasions for reproaching him with infringement of the Sabbath, they must have been connected with surgical manipulations or operations; the clay occasionally mentioned as having been made with spittle, suggests, though obscurely, the employment of natural means; and there are instances in Mark, perhaps only a few out of many which really occurred, of slow progressive cures, indicating a natural process. But then it is difficult to conceive that the eye-witnesses, and the narratives derived from them, should have so completely overlooked what was most material, namely, the nature of the means employed; and if in the account of the centurion at Capernaum, they entirely suppressed a mission of the disciples to the sick person, and so represented as a miraculous healing at a distance, what in

reality was a natural cure effected by assistants sent for the purpose, the worst suspicions are excited, and we must begin to think with Reimarus.

And yet the whole of this attempt to explain miracles, arose, as its author from his own point of view justly boasts, from anxiety to defend the Bible. He says, attempts to reduce the miraculous narratives to the natural order of cause and effect are by no means designed for the purpose of explaining them away, but rather to give credibility to what really took place, and to prevent any after-thought about minor circumstances from interfering with our confidence in essentials. When, for instance, we read that an angel of the name of Gabriel visited Mary to announce to her the maternity of the Messiah, the supernatural circumstances might easily induce us to reject the whole story as fabulous. This indiscriminate rejection of good and bad is prevented, if we learn from some sagacious commentator to distinguish fact and opinion as mingled in the Gospel narratives. We shall then dismiss the story about the angel as a supposition of Mary; but that some one visited her and made the announcement,—this, as the true essence of the story, we shall firmly retain. So that, according to the theory of Dr. Paulus, the main point in the above instance is, that some person visited Mary, that such person was the angel Gabriel being secondary; or, again, the main point in the transfiguration is, that Jesus appeared in bright radiance on Thabor or Hermon talking with two men; whether the luminosity was supernatural or an accidental reflection of the morning sun,—whether the two persons conversing with him were really Moses and Elias, or two anonymous followers,—these are mere secondary matters. But this is entirely to misrepresent the truth of the case. That which Paulus reserves in these instances as essential, the Evangelists themselves would have considered so far secondary, or rather worthless, that they would not have thought of telling the story at all under such limitations; that

which Paulus calls their opinion about the fact, constituted, in their estimation, the fact itself; the circumstances are the very essence of the story, and if the fact was not as they tell it, it did not happen at all.

Paulus indeed knows well how to make the most of the residuary fact which he retains, for example in the just cited instance of the Annunciation. Of course, he is unable to recognise the birth by the Holy Ghost, as intimated in the Gospels; he insists on viewing the fact apart from the opinions of the writer and the persons concerned. The fact he supposes to be partly negative, namely, that Joseph was not the father of Jesus; partly the positive certainty, that Mary was nevertheless pure and innocent. That she became pregnant through some spiritual influence of the Deity is an idea of her own, or of the Gospel writers, in which we cannot concur. What, then, are we to suppose? Here the unknown visitor, mistaken by Mary for the angel Gabriel, comes in very opportunely. He was a confidential person, of David's lineage, sent by the sagacious Elizabeth to her somewhat narrow-minded cousin, in order to furnish a Messiah, to whom her own darling son might act as precursor, he being incapable, as descended from the tribe of Levi, of himself assuming the higher office. For this purpose he was to play the part of angel and Holy Ghost,—no very gratifying illustration this of the method of Dr. Paulus! For here, in trying to grasp the pure fact under his guidance, we tumble right into the mire; and assuredly dross, not gold, is the issue to which his method of interpretation generally leads.

Looking from the commencement to the end of the life of Jesus, one could wish not to be obliged to say, to the prejudice of Herder, that all the monstrosities invented on this subject by Paulus, Venturini, Brenneke, &c., are no more than the consistently completed results of his suggestions. The Essenes in white garments,—to which Paulus reduces the angel apparition at the sepulchre,—might raise suspicions of

some intrigue; but Paulus follows Herder's lead in insisting that the resuscitation took place independently of any deliberate human agency, through a providentially directed, though now inexplicable, concurrence of natural causes. The death of Jesus was unreal; his body the same after resuscitation as before; requiring not nourishment only, but especially careful treatment in consequence of the ill treatment to which it had been submitted, and under which, apparently only a few weeks later, it finally succumbed.

Thus the contradiction of form and matter, of the contents of the life of Jesus, and the historical treatment of them, becomes in the hands of Paulus absolute. In excluding the supernatural elements of the original narrative, Paulus allows that the materials, as given in the originals, are incapable of historical treatment; while, on the other hand, by allowing these originals to retain their place as authentic historical records, he impliedly admits that he has failed in his undertaking. For if the Gospels are really and truly historical, it is impossible to exclude miracles from the life of Jesus; if, on the other hand, miracles are incompatible with history, then the Gospels are not really historical records.

5. SCHLEIERMACHER.

Schleiermacher saw quite as clearly and decidedly as either Herder or Paulus the impossibility of miracles, and the undeviating constancy of the law of nature; while, on the other hand, not even Herder so distinctly and emphatically asserted the divinity of Christ as he did. In Schleiermacher's view Christ was a man whose religious feeling—as determining his every thought and act—might be truly termed an in-dwelling of God; he was one who as an historical individual was also the type or ideal of humanity, and in whom this typical character was also truly historical.

It is well known how, in his "Glaubenslehre," Schleiermacher, in order to determine the doctrine as to Christ's person, represents the Ebionite on the one side and the Docetist on the other as the two heretical extremes, the two theological buoys or beacons, between which we have to steer the course of our thought carefully without touching either; and this he made the basis of his Lectures on the Life of Jesus.* We have to recognise in Christ a supernatural or divine element: not indeed as a special nature distinct from the human, but only as we conceive the agency of the divine spirit to exist in the faithful Christian, namely, as an inward influence, in the case of Christ absolutely controlling his whole being; a denial of such a divine element in Christ were "Ebionitic." On the other hand, this divine element in Christ appeared and acted in the form and according to the laws of nature and of man; to deny Christ's true humanity were "Docetic."

Of these two propositions the first is substantially one with the orthodox hypothesis, as given in Church doctrine and Gospel history; the other represents the claim of science, and particularly the condition under which alone a biography of Jesus can be written. But that the two really coincide, that no inconsistency will be found in the case of Christ between the claim of science and the ideas of faith, this is no scientific inference, but only a pious assumption. This Schleiermacher well knows; he therefore suggests that in deciphering the biography of Jesus from the Gospel narratives we must keep this assumption distinctly before us as a problem, not as a matter of creed in which it is taken as affirmatively and conclusively resolved. If then we meet in

* These hitherto unpublished Lectures lie before me in the form of an abstract, from two MS. reports prepared at the time.

[Since this note was written, a work purporting to be a report of Schleiermacher's Lectures on the Life of Jesus has been published by Rüttenik; to which Dr. Strauss has just issued a detailed rejoinder.—*Translator.*]

the life of Jesus occasions in which the unmixed influences of the divinity seem absent, we must then make the hypothesis of faith bend in the Ebionitish direction; if, on the other hand, we find cases in which truly divine qualities appear, breaking through the ordinary laws of human action, the claims of science must be abandoned, and with them the historical treatment of the life of Jesus.

Now, whether we are compelled to choose between these alternatives, or, adopting the assumption of Schleiermacher, may so blend their requisitions as to produce a life of Jesus satisfying at once the demands of faith and those of science, this must depend on the fact whether the two propositions, whose concurrency is assumed by Schleiermacher, really concur in the Gospel narratives. There we certainly find one of them, namely, that which we termed the hypothesis of faith, though under a somewhat altered form. Divinity appears and acts in Christ sometimes as a moral influence, sometimes as superior insight and supernatural power, independently of any real hindrance. What Schleiermacher calls the Ebionitic view of Christ is not discoverable, with the exception of some slight traces, in our actual New Testament writings. If, on the other hand, it be asked whether the Gospel writers conceived, like Schleiermacher, the divine element in Christ as acting only according to the usual laws of man and nature, the answer must be that the idea did not occur to them. In the notion of miracle so liberally applied by them to the circumstances of Christ, a violation of those barriers is already implied; and thus arises for Schleiermacher, as for every one who concerns himself with the life of Jesus, the necessity of coming to a clear understanding about the miracles.

To dismiss miracles from the Gospel history is not his intention, for he sees clearly how intimately they are connected with the accounts, and how arbitrary was the proceeding of Paulus in trying to get rid of them. In order,

therefore, to blend the indispensable attributes of credibility and naturalness, he tries to make the conception of the natural as elastic as possible. For instance, the marvellous insight attributed to Jesus he describes as a superlative human knowledge obtained through a keen susceptibility to first impressions, and by no means as a miraculous vision of things distant; a theory not easily to be reconciled with the conversation of the Samaritaness, and entirely inconsistent with the seeing of Nathanael under the fig-tree, which was therefore taken by Schleiermacher, as by Paulus, for a natural accident. The acted miracles of Jesus consist in great measure of cures of sick persons; and here Schleiermacher is ready with an elastic formula able to comprehend nearly the whole of them within natural limits; yet without any open contradiction of the narrative, such as was implied in the medicinal expedients interpolated by Paulus. The divine power of Christ, he says, acted in these cases through the word; the word acts naturally on the mind of the hearer, this again upon his organism; and it is impossible to fix a limit of how far the influence so originated may extend. So that the cures wrought by Christ were really supernatural and miraculous, inasmuch as no one could have wrought them but one in whom, as in him, the overmastering and sole impulse was divine; yet they were also natural, because the supernatural influence attained its end through entirely natural means. All the Gospel miracles, says Schleiermacher, which are reducible to this formula, may be easily explained; those which are not so reducible will cause much difficulty. So that, however expansive the idea of the natural—and certainly Schleiermacher often carries that expansiveness to extravagant lengths—it is still inadequate, by his own admission, to comprehend all the miracles, and then his only remaining alternative, consistently with the assumption with which he started, is to leave the refractory miracles alone.

To the number of these residuary unmanageable miracles

belong especially the raisings of the dead, because, in these cases, there is no conscious being to whom the stirring words of Jesus can be supposed to be addressed. And it little avails the author to treat these instances, among which, with only a slight disguise of language, that of Lazarus is included, as mere cases of suspended animation; since even so the unconscious state of the patient leaves no opening through which the spiritual influences of Jesus can be supposed to operate. He therefore here falls back into the common natural explanation; Jesus was first to notice and announce the symptoms of continuing life. There is still more difficulty in the marvellous control over inanimate nature exhibited by Jesus; as in the narrative of the loaves and changing water into wine; here Schleiermacher makes his escape by cavilling at the document, which, by inaccurate description, makes a satisfactory judgment impossible; in similar fashion he disposes of the walking on the sea, and cursing of the fig-tree. As to the miracles of which Jesus himself was the subject, as those of the baptism and transfiguration, Schleiermacher goes hand in hand with Paulus.

Not so, however, in regard to the miraculous stories of the infancy. Greater delicacy of critical feeling and freer views as to the nature of the documents prevented Schleiermacher's following the example of Paulus in expounding poetry prosaically, or striving to force into harmony the evidently incongruous genealogies of Matthew and Luke. His confidence in the fourth Gospel, as being the authentic account of an eye-witness, made him the bolder in treating the three first Evangelists as post-apostolic compilers of older documents, not always to be relied on as strictly historical; and since John is silent as to the story of the infancy, Schleiermacher here found himself at liberty to ascribe the discrepancies between Matthew and Luke in part, at least, to the unhistorical nature of their materials. The free attitude taken by the author in regard to the miraculous commence-

ment of the life of Jesus is well known from his "Glaubenslehre;" the silence of the fourth Gospel affording an additional justification for such procedure; yet if, in this case, he hesitated not to treat the accounts of Matthew and Luke as rather poetical than historical, why, it may be asked, does he not go farther in the same direction; why, for example, in the story of the temptation, where John is equally silent, does he compromise the matter by supposing it to be some parable of Jesus, mistakenly interpreted as a history? He does however tell us, in this instance, the nature of the hindrance. He says, in the Lectures above referred to on the Life of Jesus: "To take the whole as mythical, *i. e.* as a poetical fiction "formed within the circle of Christendom, is impossible, *since* "there is no mythus in the New Testament—mythi are a product "of ante-historic times." But this is a mere begging of the question: why should there be no mythi in the New Testament? What is to be understood as ante-historic times? Such objections to the mythical interpretation are at once seen to be superficial; they only shew how thoroughly uncongenial that view was to Schleiermacher, how obstinately he still remained attached in his Scripture exegesis to those rationalistic conceptions from which, in regard to doctrine, he had emancipated himself.

An especially striking illustration of the same fact will be found in his treatment of the resurrection. Here he quite agrees with the natural explanation of Paulus: Jesus was not quite dead; he was recalled to life through a special providential arrangement, or rather pure accident. Certain persons happening to pass who did not know that Jesus was in the sepulchre, removed the stone, and so enabled him to come out; his being mistaken for the gardener by Mary Magdalen, arose from the fact of his having borrowed the gardener's clothes, his own being left behind in the sepulchre; and if we read that he came where the doors were shut, this implies the admission that they were before

open. That the appearances to the disciples after his resurrection were so hasty and mysterious is no proof that his re-appearance was incorporeal, since it might have been so arranged from prudential considerations to avoid exposing him to the danger of arrest. The resuscitated body would of course die, and Schleiermacher is not able to see any satisfactory proof of its supernatural removal from earth; although it may not be denied that such a mode of removal had been very appropriate in the view of tranquillising the disciples, who might otherwise have spent their time in going about seeking vainly for Jesus.* Such are the lame issues of Schleiermacher's *Life of Jesus*; here, too, the professed object of reconciling faith and science remains unaccomplished.

The hypothesis of the Gospel writers is that divinity was the operating principle in Christ, irresistibly determining his every word and action; but it is not ours, it is not that of those who, relying on scientific experience, consider Jesus, in the full sense of the word, a man.

Our hypothesis is that the divine element in Christ can have appeared only under the form of a man, acting according to the laws of nature;—but it is not that of the New Testament writers when correctly and naturally interpreted.

It is therefore equally perverse to force upon us their conception, and to force ours upon them; it is impossible to reconcile faith with the science of to-day by any such mode of proceeding.

6. HASE.

Schleiermacher's *Lectures on the Life of Christ*, have hitherto not been published with his other lectures by his

* See an Essay of my own—on Schleiermacher's theory of the Resurrection, in Hilgenfeld's *Magazine of Scientific Theology*.

disciples.* They promised so little support to the conservatism which became more and more dominant among Schleiermacher's followers,—were so frail a bulwark against the inroads of mythical interpretation,—in short, were so clearly the foot of clay to the polished brass of Schleiermacher's theology, that it seemed wise and prudent to suppress them. Besides, the lectures had already effected their object, since numbers of persons entertaining fundamentally similar views had crowded to hear them and disseminate their purport. In almost every treatise on the life of Jesus, down to the most recent date, we find traces of the work of Schleiermacher; he passed on this subject as well as others for an oracle; a designation which the ambiguity of his whole nature makes strictly appropriate.

Hase self-complacently calls his "Manual," first published in 1829, an essay towards a really scientific life of Jesus; contrasting with it my own work six years later in date, which he calls critically one-sided, and therefore erroneous, or at least useless. The fact is, however, that it was precisely the unscientific character of his work which especially contributed to impress upon me the necessity of writing mine; and his later editions only prove that until criticism has effected a clearance of the effete rubbish, even the finest biographical edifice stands on unsafe ground.

In Hase, as in Schleiermacher, there are elements of hesitation and contradiction, and these arise in both from the same causes; namely, uncertainty in the conception of miracle, and reliance on the fourth Gospel as the narrative of an eye-witness. Hase's real attitude in regard to miracle is, like Schleiermacher's, entirely rational; and the three first Gospels, which he considers as more or less secondary and derivative, would not in themselves have prevented him from

* A volume has just appeared under this title, edited by Rütenik, Berlin, 1864, to which, as above mentioned, Dr. Strauss has replied at length.—*Translator*.

setting up this view in opposition to the tenor of their narratives. This however is prevented by his sentimental predilections for the fourth Gospel, that very Gospel in which the notion of miracle is sensibly extended and intensified; and hence a contradiction, which being unrecognised and unconfessed, engenders a series of compromises. The fact that the Gospel, assumed to be the most reliable, contains the most emphatic miracles, necessitates some concessions as to the possibility of their occurrence; on the other hand, since it is impossible to admit an absolutely irrational interruption of the laws of nature, it becomes necessary, when anything of the kind appears in John, to suppose a gap in his credibility.

"Perhaps," says Hase, and the word may serve as a preparative for the giddiness incidental to the frail footing afforded by his lucubrations—"perhaps all the cures of Jesus were of the peculiar kind in which the power of will over the body is often seen, though in a less marked degree;"* thus exactly following Schleiermacher, whom he also imitates in turning the raisings of the dead, not to be explained by his formula, into cases of suspended animation. But besides this, animal magnetism is appealed to—"that mysterious power welling up out of the great life of nature to heal its ailments"—as offering a comparison with that manifested in Jesus. When Hase speaks of this power as a peculiar faculty in Jesus, he feels that he is jeopardising the dignity of his subject; since a physically sanative power would as little prove superior personal dignity or doctrinal truth as would exceptional bodily strength or acuteness of the senses. Hence Hase prefers to designate the miraculous endowment of Jesus as "*a clear dominion of the spirit over nature,—originally conferred upon man at his creation, and regaining its original force through the sinless purity of Jesus, to quell sickness and death; so that there is here no interruption of nature's laws, but only a restoration of her pristine har-*

* *Leben Jesu*, Sect. 48, 4th Ed.

"mony and order." Much would, doubtless, be at once gained by such an explanation; since not only the miraculous cures of Jesus, but his "despotic command over external nature" would be ranged under it, being partly conceived as the "acceleration of a natural process." But Hase does not feel himself safe in this position, as adopted by modern mystical orthodoxy, since he cannot forget that man's dominion over nature is conditioned upon knowledge and interpretation of its laws; whereas those pretended acts of authority on the part of Jesus have a magical character, which is sometimes repudiated by Jesus himself. Since, therefore, Schleiermacher's intensified power of will over body appears insufficient, while the asserted dominion of the second Adam over nature is extremely hazardous, Hase comes at last to the conclusion, that "there existed in Jesus some unknown powers, some sudden force of healing, for which many analogies may be found."* And so, after many ineffectual efforts, right and left, the object of his search turns out to be an unknown quantity, an *x*, having no intelligible connection with the religious mission of Jesus; a hopelessly problematical caprice, which, after all, like the formula of Schleiermacher above considered, does not suffice to make all the miracles, as, *e.g.*, those of John, conceivable.

For instance, at the very beginning of the fourth Gospel, the "unknown powers" fail to explain the change of water into wine at Cana; and Hase, in the absence of clear ideas upon the subject, has to borrow the chicanery of Schleiermacher, and moreover adds the happy discovery that "John's" presence with the other disciples at the scene is not clearly "attested."† Here we have the novelty that a writer, generally assumed to have been eye-witness of the events related, is nevertheless only to have the credit of his imputed character in cases where his presence is specially attested. Yet,

* Hase's Letter to Baur on the Tübingen School, p. 13.

† *Leben Jesu*, Sect. 50.

even if John happened to be absent at the marriage feast, still he must be presumed to have soon after rejoined the disciples, and must have then unavoidably heard what had occurred; and it can scarcely be credited, that "later views" and feelings" induced him to change what was so told him as an ordinary event or pleasantry into a stupendous miracle. But besides this marvel peculiar to himself, John has those of the feeding the five thousand, and walking on the sea, in common with the other Evangelists; and thus at last brings the biographer denying absolute miracle, into the dilemma of having to accord to the eye-witness the implicit belief which he denies to narratives from hearsay. And yet how are we sure even in this instance that he was so? In Mark and Luke it is certainly said, just before the account of the miraculous loaves, that the twelve missionary "Apostles" had returned from their journey; but how easily may the visionary John have been tempted to stop behind, rejoining Jesus only in Capernaum or later, in which case he would not have personally witnessed those two perplexing events, and may eventually, as Evangelist, have adopted them in the form assigned to them in later legend!* John is evidently to this class of theologians a great and general favourite, who, however, sometimes goes a little too far with his miraculous stories; and then it becomes necessary to send him out of the way in order to get rid of an inconvenient entanglement, and to be able to accept so much of his narrative as suits us, and no more.

And as the apostolic eye-witness recounts many things as to which our purely scientific biographer would gladly evade his evidence, so on the other hand he omits much which as an Apostle he must have seen, and as to which his silence is remarkable. Had the author of the fourth Gospel really seen the cases of *dæmoniacks*, of which we hear so much claiming our general confidence, from the three first Evangelists,—cases no doubt esteemed especially conclusive by

* *Leben Jesu*, Sect. 74, 75.

the fellow-countrymen of Jesus as especially tending to establish his claims and character,—it would be indeed strange, if out of consideration for the more refined taste and education of his Greek readers, he passed over this important class of miracles in silence.* Still stranger were it if, supposing him to be really John,—*i.e.* one of the more intimate apostolic circle who witnessed the agony in the garden,—he omitted this important incident merely because, after the hierarchical invocation contained in his 17th chapter, the prayer of Gethsemane “would not have contributed to the literary unity of “his work;”† for thus he would appear only as an ornamental writer, or literary artist, who may have invented one thing as easily as he suppressed another.

In dealing with the discourses attributed to Jesus in John, Hase is delicate and cautious. They are, in his opinion, “*more or less freely developed reproductions of the recollected words of Jesus,—sometimes unconsciously intermingled and modified by the disciple’s own long continued lucubrations, in which case, and especially where they are mere explanations of the Logos-theory, their historical value becomes uncertain.*” But it is so throughout; and this sometimes the author himself admits,‡ especially in the language used by Jesus as to his pre-existence, which of course is not available to the scientific biographer. But we have now a right to ask—if in regard to the discourses of the fourth Gospel, we are scarcely in a single instance sure whether we have before us, not to say the words, but even the ideas of Jesus, and not rather those of the Evangelist; if as to the events we have no assurance of John’s personal presence, except where he actually tells us he was present, and consequently is not recounting a mere subsequently collected or invented miraculous story,—we are entitled, I say, to ask in what consists the especial reliability of this Gospel? And when Hase assures us that his view of the story of the infancy as a poetical legend

* As supposed by Hase, *Leben Jesu*, Sect. 49.

† Hase, Sect. 107.

‡ *Ibid.* 8, 65.

is no detriment whatever to the value of the apostolic testimony, since this commences only with John's baptism,* we are again entitled to ask, How are our Gospels benefited by this testimony, if neither of the three first be the work of an Apostle, and the apostolical author of the fourth be so very incompetent a witness?

The ambiguity and inconsistency of Hase's theory is especially observable at the close of his book, where he speaks of the resurrection and ascension. First he cavils as to the reality of the death of Jesus, because only incipient putrescence or lesion of some vital organ can be a sure token of death; now the last is not proved in the case of Jesus; the former is excluded even for the orthodox, by the passage, Acts ii. 27, 31. Hase consequently affects to stand on orthodox ground with his assertion that the organic vitality of the body of Jesus was not wholly extinct;† but this is delusive and erroneous. According to the true meaning of the Gospels, as well as popular acceptation, the soul of Jesus was already severed from the body, and could not have returned to it without a miracle; according to Hase, only the external functions were suspended, and from the still unextinguished source of life within were susceptible of restoration. The same play of ambiguity surrounds the supposed cause of re-animation. "We are almost tempted to think," says Hase,‡ "that death, in the sense of violent dissolution, did not originally appertain to an immortal being, but only became "what it is through sin; he who was wholly free from sin, was "therefore also exempt from this unnatural exacerbation of "death." We already know Hase too well to take his high-sounding language seriously; his real meaning appears in the words—"It was to be expected that the wondrous healing "power which Jesus had at command should exhibit its power "in himself."§

* Sect. 26.

† Sect. 116.

‡ Sect. 120.

§ Ibid.

Now, Hase elsewhere describes this power as a faculty or talent; and the exercise of a faculty necessarily implies the continuing life of the person endowed with it; we cannot easily conceive a faculty of self-reanimation, and must therefore understand Hase's words as intended to express that force of vitality in Jesus, which in his lifetime spread its healing influences to others, and at length appeared upon the cross as tenacity of life in himself. Yet the purely scientific biographer contents himself with less than this. "Any way," he repeats after Schleiermacher—thus giving up all he had before said—"since Jesus, without any concerted intrigue, expected a real death, and since such death was not humanly to be evaded, his resuscitation, however brought about, must be considered an evident work of providence."* In his humour of renunciation, the author might have gone a little further, and, instead of "providence," have said simply "accident;" for had the soldiers strictly executed their orders, and broken the bones of Jesus with the others, there could have been no resurrection in the sense of Hase. As to the notices in the Gospels of appearances of the resuscitated Jesus which seem unfavourable to his theory, Hase explains all those indicating a visionary or phantom nature as subjective expressions of alarm on the part of the disciples, and others, such as the non-recognition by Mary Magdalen and the disciples at Emmaus, as arising from the absence of characteristic peculiarities of feature. On the other hand, those denoting a natural humanity in the resuscitated, as a body obvious to sense and requiring nutrition, he firmly holds as objectively historical.

Just before the last event in the career of Jesus, namely, his ascension, Hase again simulates an airy exaltation in the words—"in itself it is sufficiently probable that Jesus left this earth in some way other than the usual one."† But since he does not allow the necessity of a visible ascension,

* Sect. 116, 120.

† Sect. 112.

treating this as a mythical expression of the idea of a return to the Father, he seemingly leaves Jesus, after all, to share the common destiny of mortals; and this, indeed, very shortly after his resuscitation, since a long sojourn in obscurity had been as inconsistent with his character as with history. Hase here forgets his former judicious remark,—that a roving invalid could hardly have appeared to the Apostles a victor over death; but such specific inquiries are unpalatable to this sort of theologians, and inopportune curiosity is finally silenced with the words—“Even the Gospel history has its “mysteries.”* But the Gospel history tells us clearly enough that the raised Jesus ascended without death visibly or invisibly to his Father in heaven; the mystery, or rather prohibition to inquire, proceeds only from the hesitation and irresolution of those theologians who can neither believe the miraculous ascension on one hand, nor accept a simple death of Jesus on the other.

7. MY OWN CRITICAL LIFE OF JESUS.

The three last-named works on the Life of Jesus, that of Paulus, the Manual of Hase, and Schleiermacher's Lectures, were the chief achievements in this department when about thirty years ago I first turned my attention to the subject. I felt satisfied with none of them; all seemed to have in some respect failed. Paulus missed the mark through dogged consistency in a wrong method; the other two marred many right views by obsequious efforts to blend the inconsistent. In all there seemed to be a general cause of failure in a mistaken view of the sources of the Gospel history. The contradiction between the supernatural accounts and the natural element which alone is historically available, could not be

* Sect. 122.

reconciled so long as the Gospels, or even a single one of them, was taken as truly and fully historical. This indeed they could not be, for the simple reason that they contain supernaturalism; but the Lives of Jesus hitherto written had in fact been only varied attempts to eliminate this supernaturalism, or else to invest it in some sort with a natural appearance.

The object now, therefore, must be to shew that the attempt to conceal or to explain away the supernatural in the Gospel details was vain, and that consequently they were not to be claimed as strictly historical. The inference rested not only on the miraculous character of the accounts, but on their contradictions and inconsistencies, as well with general history and probability as with each other, especially when it was found that in each instance of an ostensibly supernatural occurrence it was far more difficult to conceive the event so happening than certain causes which might have originated an unhistorical account of it.

Here then was the great advantage of being at once relieved from efforts as distressing as they were fruitless to blend inconsistencies, and invest impossibilities with an air of historical credibility; but, on the other hand, there appeared a great and irreparable loss. Instead of the real Christ hitherto assumed to be represented in the Gospels, there remained nothing but a later conception of him. Instead of historically reliable details of the actual circumstances of his life, the Gospel narratives were in great measure reduced to a legendary deposit of contemporaneous Messianic ideas, the latter perhaps partially modified by his peculiar individuality, his teaching, and his fate. Of the discourses, too, of Jesus, a large portion, and especially those relating to the exalted dignity of his person in the fourth Gospel, were set aside as the artificial product of later circumstances and ideas. And thus the form of Christ which, as represented in the Gospels, had hitherto seemed to present a firm and dis-

tinged, if not a complete outline, faded away into misty obscurity.

Certainly, from this time forward, no one could any longer think of forming an image of the person and life of Jesus by a sort of mosaic combination of the individual narratives, in which the sole question should be how the different parts were to be arranged and adjusted to each other, especially how John's materials were to be fitted with those of his three predecessors. No single portion of the Gospel narrative, in its actual condition, would any longer be maintained as strictly historical; the whole had to be cast into the crucible of criticism, in order to see what after the severance of foreign and baser elements would remain as historical gold.

The consequence of this proceeding and its results, as indeed of all severe criticism, was to produce an impression of discontent at being impoverished and seemingly plundered, in being forced to admit the nonentity of many fancied possessions. To compare small things with great, there appeared here within a limited department of knowledge the same phenomenon which occurred at the time of Kant's "Critique." How wealthy and strong then seemed the Wolffian Metaphysics, and how fell a sweep was made in this rich inventory of fancied *à priori* knowledge by the Critique of Pure Reason! Men, however, refused to admit the deficit, and went on heedlessly lavishing their imaginary wealth, until bankruptcy stared them in the face. Meantime, Kant had pointed out a narrow way through which philosophy might still secure a legitimate store of reliable knowledge; his followers took the path indicated, and as far as they kept within it they found themselves rewarded. So it was in regard to the results of Gospel criticism. The majority of theologians could not bear to abandon their fancied wealth; they treated the inferences of criticism as wholly unimportant. All however that has been written on the life of Jesus from this point of view will appear as the work of mere camp followers,

and we shall find the subject to have been really advanced only by those who, contented with honest gains, pursued the narrow path pointed out by criticism.

8. REACTION AND COMPROMISE: NEANDER, EBRARD, WEISSE, EWALD—RECENT ADDITIONAL EFFORTS: KEIM, RENAN.

Neander's "Life of Jesus Christ"* was written expressly as an answer to my Critical Life of Jesus. The expanded title is here significant. To the human name is superadded that of the Messianic office or dignity; as if the generally rationalistic direction hitherto given to the treatment of the "Life of Jesus," as already indicated in its limited denomination and in its negative results, was now to be met by an orthodox reaction.

To Neander's "Life of Jesus Christ" are prefixed three mottoes, derived respectively from Athanasius, Pascal, and Plato; all the great spirits of theology and philosophy are invoked in this latter-day tribulation, and we miss the presence only of that motto which to the merit of perfect appropriateness would have added the recommendation of its Biblical origin, namely, the saying in Mark ix. 24, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief!" In Neander the critical attack encountered an irresolute resistance, like that of a garrison half inclined to capitulate, and already under partial promise to surrender. His general position was that of sentimentality as opposed to logic, that of faith in Christ as an absolute revelation of Divinity to man; he was not, however, destitute of philosophical culture, though of a somewhat fantastic kind; and, in addition to the necessity he had felt in the course of his extensive labours in Church history to apply the resources of historical criticism, he possessed an innate truthfulness, which, though not always proof against the influences of

* First Edition, 1837; fifth, 1852.

pious self-deception and party feeling, kept him far above the shabby tactics of those who, in order to give no advantage to their opponents, refuse to make a concession which they inwardly feel to be just. A book like Neander's "Life of Jesus Christ" made under these conditions may excite our pity; the author himself admits in the Preface that it bears "the marks of its production in an age of crisis, of isolation, of pain, and of throes."

Neander, wherever he can, leans on the "great divine," Schleiermacher; but we have already had occasion to convince ourselves how frail is this support, especially in relation to the life of Jesus; how much more likely it is to wound than to help the hand that rests upon it. A theologian of Neander's romantic turn and imaginative disposition would of course prefer the fourth before the other Gospels; and having moreover the "great divine" and generally inflexible critic on his side, he fancies his position secured against any sceptical extravagances. He treats the Evangelists generally as writing under inspiration, but an inspiration apart from their educational development as men, and regulating, not the historical, but only the religious part of their accounts; as if the historical and the religious were not indissolubly connected. Hence an eclectic procedure, whose aim is to set aside all that seems at the present day most paradoxical and offensive, in order the better to be enabled to maintain against the mythical interpretation the historical veracity of the remainder. The miracles of Jesus are brought nearer to modern conceptions by distinguishing between ordinary nature and a higher nature; also by referring to laws of nature as yet undiscovered, by means of which at some future day the miracles are to be explained; the change of water into wine at Cana was an exaltation of the natural element into a full-bodied kind of mineral water possessing vinous properties; while, in regard to the miracle of the loaves, Neander's indulgent treatment of the natural expla-

nation betrays his own strong inclination to adopt it. The same tendency is also seen in the occasional partiality for Mark intermingling with his general preference for John. Mark is often praised for being what is called "graphic;" but the real source of the satisfaction derived from him consists in the facilities seemingly afforded by his materialistic and successional description of several miracles for their natural explanation.

So irresolute an attitude gave an indisputable advantage to the critical attack; the enemy had obtained a footing within the gates of the citadel, and must soon become master of the whole. For if it was admitted as possible that Luke, left to his own resources in historical matters, gives a false reason for the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem when ascribing it to the Census, what certainty remains that he was born in Bethlehem at all? And if the essential part of the account of the ascension be merely that Christ did *not* pass through death in his removal from an earthly to a higher existence, it may be asked how can we be sure of that, if we distrust the narrative alleging the removal to have been effected by exaltation to heaven?

From this point of view it may be thought judicious in some theologians to have gone back from this sort of hesitating, unsatisfactory compromise to absolute miracle. We must either admit miracles or reject them: if we admit them we have no right to make distinctions, allowing those having some analogy with natural processes, and setting aside the rest as magical. All miracles are necessarily magical, because they imply an immediate interference of the Supreme Cause in the series of finite causes, and the resemblance to a natural process can only be ostensible and casual. Certainly where such a resemblance appears, as for instance in cases of healing, where the real transaction may be supposed to have only been a more emphatic exemplification of what is elsewhere well known as the power of mind over the morbid imagina-

tions and affections of the body,—it becomes easier to cheat oneself into the idea of believing miracle, when really we are only amusing ourselves with a dissolving phantasmagoria of the natural. Where, on the other hand, the analogy fails, as, for instance, in the miracle of the loaves and the change of water into wine (my own criticism having meantime contributed to disabuse theologians as to Olshausen's device of an "accelerated natural process"), it certainly required no small amount of assurance for any one to stand forth in the face of the present age with an ostensibly sincere profession of implicit belief in the miracle. When Gfrörer* declares, in relation to the healing of the cripple at Bethesda, or the distant son of the Galilean nobleman, that he regards these cases simply as miracles, this we understand as a slap in the face administered to the scepticism of the philosophical critic, or as a thump upon the tap-room table on which he made his peroration; but we know how little he is in earnest from the way in which he contrives to set aside other miracles through the natural explanation in the style of Paul. When Meyer, in his Commentary on the Gospels, after successively combating all other constructions of miracles, acquiesces at last in the necessity of leaving them miraculous as he found them, the generally creditable determination of the interpreter to accept the simple data of his author becomes in this instance an admission of his own imbecility.

On the other hand, Ebrard's writings upon this subject,† directed especially against my critical Life of Jesus, bespeak the consummate insolence of orthodox reaction. Here not an inch is conceded; miracle asserts its full pretensions; the Evangelists never err, never contradict each other; criticism must be altogether wrong or founded on false assumptions; it must be decried if it cannot be confuted. Ebrard

* Geschichte des Urchristenthums, 5 Bde. 1838.

† Scientific Critique of the Gospel History, 1st Ed. 1842; 2nd, 1850. Also, Olshausen's Biblical Commentary, revised by Ebrard, 1853.

charges me with frivolity for considering the (in my opinion) unhistorical farewell speech of Jesus, given in John, tedious; he holds it blasphemous in me to urge certain reproachful expostulations in regard to the Agony of Gethsemane,*—not against the real Jesus or the Jesus described by any one of the Evangelists,—but the imaginary being devised by those theologians who insist on mixing up the account of the Agony in the three first Gospels with the long parenthetical address of consecration in John; and yet this censorious critic answers the misgivings expressed by myself and others as to the paradoxical fact of the money found in the mouth of the hooked fish (Matt. xvii. 27), by the suggestion that the fish may possibly have passed the money through the cesophagus at the instant of Peter's opening its mouth to look! Surely the author cannot be serious when using such arguments; he seems to utter them with a grimace, as much as to say, "I well know they are good for nothing, but they are good enough for you, nay, for all purposes, so long as the Church has good things in its gift, and we of the Con-sistory have candidates to examine." This shabby behaviour of Ebrard has been felt to be offensive even by the better class of orthodox theologians; and it only shews how keenly the edge of criticism was at first felt, even by candid minds, when a man like Bleek could say of the above cited work of Ebrard, that it evinced sentiments and talents full of high promise for the interests of science and the Church. Of its contributions to science the scientific journals have no longer anything to say; but the Evangelicals of the Palatinate will long have occasion to remember and commemorate the aid it afforded to the Church.

Weisse assumed a different attitude in relation to my *Life of Jesus*. He was one of the first to write a rational critique on the book. Soon afterwards he brought out an "Evan-

* *Life of Jesus*, English Trans., Vol. III. p. 191.

gelical History"* of his own, in which he more especially agreed with me as to the unhistorical character of the fourth Gospel and its incompatibility with the others, corroborating with additional arguments my own reasons for thinking so. I shall presently have occasion to say more about his inconsistent partiality for this Gospel, and how he tried to make this good by distinguishing apostolical and non-apostolical portions in it. His preference for Mark, whom Wilke about the same time endeavoured, in an ingenious and elaborate but by no means convincing dissertation,† to make out to be the original Evangelist, arose, perhaps, as it did in Neander, from the seemingly more natural description of certain cures contained in this Gospel. For here Weisse, like Hase, recognised in Jesus a natural and constantly exercised power of healing; so that the often-recurring assurance of the Evangelist that he healed many sick persons, is to be regarded as strictly correct, whereas the extended narratives of individual cures are often already discoloured with fiction and supernaturalism. The source of the unhistorical ingredients in the miraculous narratives had been chiefly referred by myself to the Messianic expectations of the time, founded on Old Testament sayings and precedents; in particular cases, however, as that of the withered fig-tree, to misapprehension of some figurative utterance of Jesus. Weisse adopted the latter theory of derivation, extending it with obvious exaggeration to all the Gospel miracles; the essence in every case was, according to him, some parable or figurative utterance of Jesus, which in its transmission from mouth to mouth took the form of a miraculous external event. The crowning miracle of the resurrection,—that touchstone, as I may well call it, not of Lives of Jesus only, but of Christianity itself,—is so far treated by Weisse on the same footing as by myself, that he

* "The Gospel History critically and philosophically treated," 1838. Also, "The Gospel Problem as it stands at present," 1856.

† "The Original Evangelist," 1838.

admits no real resuscitation, whether miraculous or natural, of the Crucified, but only a vision to the disciples; striving at the same time to exclude the idea of the fantastical and magical by supposing it effected by the soul of their deceased Master, or by God himself. We have here the same hesitancy, the same intermixture of fanciful idiosyncrasy with true criticism, which characterises Weisse's general position, and which in particular stamps his "Evangelical History" as a literary curiosity.

Similar in character, as shewn by me in another place,* is Ewald's History of Christ.† His view of the person of Christ and of the miraculous cures is partly that of Schleiermacher, partly that of Paulus; of the other miracles his theory is really the mythical, only not avowedly so called; in regard to the resurrection, Ewald's long and inflated rhetoric contains literally no fragment of an idea beyond what had already been said much more clearly, though assuredly with less unction, by myself, in the corresponding section of the Life of Jesus. The pompous and stunning phraseology of Ewald's account of these events sounds like a portentous sign of that last stage of existence in which the whole of this style of theology may be said to be awaiting its doom. Only in the artificial twilight of an exuberant rhetoric is it possible to hide that inevitable result of criticism, which the light of clear and distinct ideas must inevitably reveal.

The last few years have presented us with a pair of additional works of a better kind. First, the small yet still copious work of Keim on Christ's Human Development;‡

* Dialogues of Ulrich v. Hutten, Preface, pp. xxxviii. to xlv.

† "History of Christ and his Times,"—fifth vol. of his "History of the People of Israel" (1855, 2nd Ed. 1857). Compare his "History of the Apostolic Age," or sixth vol. of the above History, 2nd Ed. 1858. Also, "The Three First Gospels translated and explained," 1850; and the "Johannean Writings," 1861.

‡ The Human Development of Jesus Christ, an Academical Address by Dr. Th. Keim (1861).—Compare the remarks on Renan in the Beilage to the Allgemeine Zeitung, 1863, Nos. 258—260. Compare also Keim's later larger work, "The History of Jesus of Nazara," translated into English.

very lately the much canvassed work of Ernest Renan.* However different the two works—of which one is a mere sketch written by a German theologian, the other an elaborately coloured picture, the work of a French man of the world—still they have one important feature in common, and even their differences challenge comparison. The feature which they have in common is the effort claimed by the first writer as peculiar to himself, but afterwards recognised by him in his character of reviewer as shared by the other, to produce a really and truly natural account of Christ, carried out according to the strictest laws of psychology and history. Keim justly admits that such a treatment of the person and life of Jesus is the demand of our age, and that the civilisation of the present day will only tolerate a history constructed upon the basis of the recognised laws and analogies of human nature. Whether, however, it can be truly said that this view of things is even now being consciously or unconsciously carried out through the whole of theology—nay, whether it is or can be fully carried out even by Keim himself, is quite another question.

One perception he certainly possesses which is most indispensable, and which is to be the more valued, inasmuch as it is rarely found beyond the circle of the school specifically bearing the name of “critical,”—namely, that it is impossible even to approach the problem of an intelligibly historical development of the life of Jesus, considered as a human being, so long as the fourth Gospel is treated as an historical document claiming preference or even parallelism with the others. In this respect Keim is greatly in advance of ordinary writers of Lives of Christ, and even of Renan himself—who proscribes the discourses of the fourth Gospel as incompatible with an intelligible biography, yet ascribes to the narratives of that Gospel a higher credibility than to those of the others. Yet, if the German theologian is in this respect superior to the

* *Vie de Jesus*, par Ernest Renan, 1863.

French, who appears to be acquainted with the results of German inquiries into this subject only so far as they have been translated into French, we shall find that he goes too far on the other side in assuming the apostolical origin and uniform character of the first Gospel, and thinks that by simply following its order and guidance he can trace all the successive stages of the development of the life of Jesus.

In another point, however, in which the Frenchman differs from the German, the advantage is decidedly in favour of the former. The German blames the French critic for making Jesus appear as one, though first, among many; never as the one only individual on whose mediation all humanity depends. On the other hand, he disclaims the conception making Christ an organic individual product or representative of the human race; Christ being really a being who is only to be conceived as resting in the bosom of the living God, far above actual humanity, even as represented by its greatest heroes. The inflated language here used betrays already the pectoral (*i.e.* sentimental) colouring which Keim expressly claims for his work; in other words, he admits a voluntary and conscious adhesion to the illusions of Christian theology, which he supposes to be compatible with the interests of science. But no actual man is so absolutely unique and superior as not to belong in some measure to a class; no man is so high relatively to the class he belongs to as not to exhibit the absence of some perfection enjoyed by some other member of it. We shall admit Jesus to have been both absolutely unique and also completely man when other instances of the same unique perfection in a particular department shall be clearly proved from history; or when it is explained how such unique perfection could exist only in the department of religion. No one determined to confine himself within the boundaries of actual humanity, will be able to get further in this task than the cosmopolitan Frenchman; true religion may be allowed to date from Jesus in the same

way that philosophy does from Socrates, and science generally from Aristotle, on the understanding, namely, that many attempts preceded these masters, and that since their time important improvements have been and may yet be made, yet still without impeaching the eminent position generally conceded to these great original founders.

The error of supposing it possible to reconcile the claim of a full and complete humanity in Jesus with that of a unique hypothetical being elevated above humanity, would much more clearly appear if Keim would undertake to write a detailed life of Jesus; still it is sufficiently evident in the sketch before us. However we may congratulate ourselves on the courage and perspicacity with which Keim traces a progressive development in the views of Jesus, shewing their dependency on outward conditioning ideas, as well as on his own observation and experience, and explaining the crowning act of his career as the result of a series of inward struggles, we are, on the other hand, puzzled to conceive how he should have thought "that perhaps the wonders of the infancy" contributed to awaken the thought of Messiahship, or how, after having accepted a psychological explanation of the miraculous cures, he should have been perplexed by the "rarer instances of miraculous powers exerted over nature," remarking, at the same time, that science had not yet arrived at any definite inference respecting them. It is easy to say, when confronting these miracles* with science, that the required proof has not yet been given; in reality, the allowance of such miracles as facts subverts the very nature of science. And when, in addition to the presentiment of approaching suffering and death, Jesus is said to have had a continually present certainty of his resurrection, without there being anything absolutely supernatural in such certainty, we cannot but reply that the certainty must have been as supernatural as the event itself; and that even if it were

* The miraculous loaves, the walking on the sea, the change of water into wine.

natural, it was impossible naturally to foreknow a chance so absolutely beyond the reach of all calculation. Keim certainly does not clearly explain his view as to the resurrection. Having renounced the visions alluded to by Renan, and generally excluded the supernatural from his treatment of the subject, there seems no other hypothesis open to him but that of suspended animation. If so, he comes at last to the signal fiasco of falling into the wake of Schleiermacher, whose views it was his ambition to surpass in point of historical accuracy; but whose sentence of reprobation no one can escape without a distinct renunciation of the notion that the ideal and the historical, the natural and supernatural, may unite in one individual; that one may be a real man, yet at the same time elevated above all real humanity.

INTRODUCTION.—PART II.

ON THE GOSPELS AS SOURCES OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

EXTERNAL TESTIMONIES AS TO THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF THE GOSPELS.

9. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

It has been said, and also plainly shewn from a series of preceding efforts, that so long as the Gospels are accepted as strictly historical, no historical view of the Life of Jesus is really possible. But must they not inevitably be so accepted? Do not the traditions of fifteen centuries, the most ancient testimonies extending even to the Apostolic age, assure us that they were composed partly by trusty eye-witnesses of Christ, partly by companions and disciples of those who were so? An admission of the latter assumption is perhaps no sufficient guarantee for the general inference; since even an eye-witness may, either from inaccuracy of perception or the unhistorical nature of his object in writing, report incorrectly; but supposing it for the moment to be so, let us proceed to examine the nature and credibility of the testimonies to the age and origin of the Gospels.

And first, we must come to a clear understanding as to what is meant by testimonies to the derivation of a writing from a particular author. We are apt in the first instance to look in these cases to the evidence of the document itself, and at once to ascribe it to the person whose name appears on the title-page. This, however, is only a provisional proceeding; should any suspicion occur as to the accuracy of the suggested derivation, we immediately begin to reflect how often books appear under fictitious names, and how originally anonymous writings are in the sequel falsely ascribed to particular persons; and

we then look about for further evidence. A composition bearing the name of a living contemporary, we believe it to be his, considering the ostensible authorship to be sufficiently proved by his silence and the absence of a disclaimer; since either he or others, the ostensible or the real writer, would have an immediate interest in protesting against imposition. Yet even here detection is not certain, unless both parties are aware of the misappropriated composition; and if the writer be dead, the matter becomes much more complicated. The dead of course is no longer able to protest; and whether others may be able and willing to do so depends on circumstances. The writing may agree more or less with what we know of the presumed author from other sources, and consequently afford internal evidence more or less perfect of its own authenticity: yet if the original manuscript is not forthcoming, then the authorship is assured only when the writing is expressly referred to as his own in letters or other posthumous memoranda, or else where some intimate associate expressly informs us that he was known to be employed on or to have actually completed such a writing; provided always that no suspicion attaches to the vouchers adduced, or to the credit, sufficiency, or motives of the witness.

The case remains substantially the same when a writing bearing a certain name is transmitted to us from antiquity. Its authenticity is assured only when it is alluded to as the work of the presumed author, either in undoubted writings of his own or in the authentic records of his contemporaries. Cicero, for instance, alludes variously to various writings of his own in his letters, and in his *Brutus** to Cæsar's Commentaries; Virgil, Horace, and Ovid refer in later writings to earlier ones; Pliny the younger supplies in one of his letters certain particulars for the use of his friend Tacitus, which the latter wished to treat of in the history he was then writing;† in another letter he enumerates the works of his uncle,

* Ch. 75.

† Epist. L. vi. 16; comp. 20.

the elder Pliny, mentioning their order and subdivisions.* The latter point is essential, and the description ought to be exact, in order to render the proof of authorship satisfactory; since the authentic writing attested by the author, or some acquaintance of his, may have been lost, and another substituted for it afterwards. Only when some near contemporary, in speaking of the work, cites passages which are still read in it, as Pliny, for instance, does an epigram of Martial,† does his testimony reach the highest degree of attainable reliability. But it is no sufficient attestation when a contemporary, or somewhat later writer, speaks of another as author of a composition, with such and such contents and title,—omitting at the same time to adduce citations of anything now read in an extant composition so entitled; and still less satisfactory is the testimony in the reversed case of a writer using the same words or expressions as another, without saying from whom he derived them, or whether they were derived at all. For here there remains the double possibility—either that both writers, independently of one another, may have borrowed the expressions from a third writer; or that these expressions were at a certain time and in certain circles a familiar form of speech, which both the supposed writers may have adopted without any written precedent whatever.

It is thus clear from the very nature of the case, that external testimonies to authenticity can seldom be so satisfactory and convincing as not to need support and confirmation from internal probabilities, arising from the agreement of a given writing with the circumstances of the age and the peculiarities of the supposed author;—seldom indeed can such external testimonies carry conviction, when external probabilities of the above kind are decidedly in the opposite scale. There are many striking instances in which the most

* Lib. iii. 5.

† iii. 21, comp. Mart. Epigr. x. 13.

imposing external testimonies have proved to be worthless and deceptive—entirely failing to maintain the authenticity in support of which they were adduced. Thus,—to give an example from my own recent experience,—there appeared at the Easter fair, A.D. 1591, a German poem entitled, “The Life, Travels, &c., of the great St. Christopher,* written by the learned Master Nicodemus Frischlin;” the same unfortunate Nicodemus who, a few months prior to the above date, lost his life in an attempt to escape from prison. His inveterate enemy and rival Crusius, in a memorandum-book which he kept of his transactions with Frischlin, nicknamed the poem, before the death of its supposed author, “Not Swan-song—but Raven’s croak.” This was, of course, on the preliminary announcement of the work, and consequently before he could have read it; but then there is no supplementary notice, such as elsewhere often occurs in his extant MS., of any doubt as to the authorship subsequently arising in his mind after he had seen it. It may be suggested that implacable animosity may have induced Crusius to suppress any misgiving really felt in attributing so malignant and discreditable a work to his hated rival; but then Frischlin’s own brother utters no single word in the way of disclaimer in a work written for the express purpose of vindicating his memory. Thus the poem of “St. Christopher” has maintained its ground to a very recent date as a posthumous work of Frischlin, and is so styled in the histories of German literature. In my capacity as biographer of the unfortunate poet, I remarked with some surprise his entire silence about the work in his numerous letters, especially those written at the close of his career during his imprisonment; nevertheless, there being no great incongruity between the poem and Frischlin’s usual style, I did not venture to impugn the

* Sometimes spelt “Christophel.” Of the life of this legendary saint no particulars are really known. Professor M. Müller in a recent lecture alluded to the legend as an example of verbal mythus.—*Translator’s Note.*

authorship. Two years ago, however, a clergyman of Hesse discovered some papers at Darmstadt, from which it indubitably appears that the real writer was a priest of the district of Isenburg, in Hanau, and that Frischlin had no more to do with it than superintending the publication, and, perhaps, inserting here and there a correction.*

A similar instance has been noticed in connection with the problem of the New Testament literature by others. A few days after the execution of King Charles I., there appeared a work under the now notorious title, *Ἐικὼν βασιλική*—an apology supposed to have been written by the king during his imprisonment. It was received with enthusiasm and implicit credence by the public, and was principally instrumental in earning for the dead monarch the honourable title of Martyr among the English people. Already in the year 1649, Milton ventured to question, in his *Iconoclastes*, the authenticity of the work, which is now admitted to be a forgery, written by the Bishop of Exeter;† nevertheless, at the close of the same century, Toland, the deist, was severely reprobated by his countrymen for assenting to these doubts in his *Life of Milton*. His assent was doubtless accompanied by certain illustrative allusions, jarring with orthodox as well as loyal prejudice; but these especially justify the propriety of selecting this instance among many others for my present purpose. “When I seriously consider,” said Toland,‡ “how all this happened among ourselves within the compass of forty years, in a time of great learning and politeness, when both parties watched over one another’s actions, and what a great revolution in civil and religious affairs was partly occasioned by the credit of that book, I cease to wonder any longer how

* See a paper by W. Nebel, in the *Anzeiger für Kunde deutscher Vorzeit*, 1161, Nos. 10 and 11.

† Dr. Gauden; see Toland’s *Life of Milton*, p. 72 sq., and also Guizot’s *Collection de Memoires relatif à la Revolution d’Angleterre*, Vol. xii. p. 113.—*Trans.*

‡ *Life of Milton*, p. 77.

“so many supposititious pieces under the name of Christ, his apostles, and other great persons, should be published and approved in those primitive times, when it was of so much importance to have them believed; when the cheats were too many on all sides for them to reproach one another, while at the same time commerce was not near so general as it is now, and the whole earth was overspread with the darkness of superstition. I doubt rather the spuriousness of several more such books is yet undiscovered, through the remoteness of those ages, the death of the persons concerned, and the decay of other monuments which might give us true information; especially when we consider how dangerous it was always for the weaker side to lay open the tricks of their adversaries, though never so gross; and that the prevailing party did actually order all those books which offended them to be burnt, or otherwise suppressed.”*

This inference of the Deist, that the possibility of literary forgery in his own day greatly increased the likelihood of its occurrence in the dark and uncritical times of early Christianity, is surely well grounded. The centuries immediately preceding and following the birth of Christ were precisely those which were most abundantly prolific of such spurious compositions; and the earliest Christians, including even some of the most learned among the Fathers, were most especially credulous in receiving them as genuine.† For instance, the author of the Canonical Epistle of Jude (v. 14) refers to a reputed prophecy of Enoch—“the seventh from Adam”—which is still read in the Apocryphal “Book of Enoch;” it follows that he, like Tertullian and other Fathers of the Church, had full confidence in the genuine character of this book, in reality a weak imitation of Daniel, now known to be, at all events, no earlier in date than the

* Comp. Lechler's History of English Deism, p. 201.

† See on this subject the instructive essay by Professor Zeller in v. Sybel's *Historical Zeitschrift*, 4, 90, ff.

century immediately preceding the Christian era. During the second century before Christ, Aristobulus, a Jew of Alexandria,* collected or invented a number of passages from the early Greek poets, in order to recommend Judaism to the Greeks, by exhibiting Monotheism and Judaical tenets as having been familiarly taught by their own poetical authorities. At the present day we are scarcely able to comprehend the audacity with which the Jew ventured to make Orpheus speak of Abraham, Moses, and the Ten Commandments, or Homer about the completion of creation in seven days, and the consecration of the Sabbath; but Aristobulus knew his readers better; the national vanity of his countrymen ensured their faith in what flattered it, and even learned Christian Fathers, as Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, appeal with implicit credence to the passages so fabricated.

Another instance of the same sort is the Sibylline Oracles, a collection of pretended vaticinations, which, originating from the second century before, down to the third century after, the Christian era, were confidently received by the Fathers as authentic utterances of the legendary heathen prophetess, the contemporary of King Tarquinius Priscus and the Trojan war!† The Sibyl is not only familiarly acquainted with the old serpent of Eden and the tower of Babel, but predicts with minute exactness the miraculous particulars of the life of Jesus, his healings of the sick and raisings of the dead, his walking on the sea and feeding the five thousand, the crown of thorns, the vinegar and gall, the crucifixion and resurrection in three days; nay, contrives in a series of acrostic verses to indicate the initial letters and titles of Christ, without suggesting the least suspicion of the true nature of the case to the Fathers quoting them. To the allegations of Celsus about the falsification of the Sibylline Oracles, Origen replied by

* See Gfrörer's *Philo and the Alexandrian Theology*, 2, 71.—Zeller's *Philosophy of Greece*, 3, 2, p. 573 ff.

† See Friedlieb's "*Sibylline Oracles*," 1852—Introduction.

calling for the production of the genuine originals;* and Lactantius† met the challenge about Christian interpolation by appealing to Varro and Cicero, who, though dead before the Christian era, allude to the Erythræan and other Sibyls; but then of the matter in question, namely, special vaticinations about Christ, these ancient worthies—be it observed—say nothing.

The Christians, who, as well as the Jews, took part in the forgery of Sibylline oracles, soon found it convenient in their controversy with the Jews, to insert interpolations into the Greek version of the Old Testament. In this way the cross of Christ was introduced into the Psalms, and the descent to hell into Jeremiah;‡ and when the Jews insisted that these passages were wanting in their copies, and that consequently the Christians must have invented them, the Christian Fathers had either the impudence or the simplicity to reply, that the Jews had insidiously suppressed or erased from their sacred books the evidence telling against them. It was naturally very important for the Christians to shew that Jesus, according to the prophecy referred to him from the fifth chapter of Micah, was actually born in Bethlehem; and in order to make this credible to Romans, Justin appealed to the records of the census which Quirinus, their first Judæan Procurator, had prepared. § Quirinus, however, was never Procurator of Judæa, but Governor of Syria; in this capacity he certainly superintended a census in Judæa, but this was nine years after the date of the nativity, according to the Gospels and Justin himself; so that there could be no record of a census of his making indicating the birth of Mary's Son; or, if there existed such a record, it could only be one of the

* *Contra Cels.* 5, 61.

† *Div. Inst.* 4, 15, 26, ff.

‡ See Psalm xvi. 10, compared with Justin's *Dial.* ch. 73, p. 298.—See also ch. 72.—See Hilgenfeld on Justin's Old Testament Citations, in *Zeller's Theological Journal* for 1850, Vol. ix. pp. 390, 391.

§ Justin, *Apol.* 1, 34. *Comp. Tertull. against Marcion*, 4, 17, 19.

same sort as the apocryphal "*Acta Pilati*,"—to which Justin also refers in relation to the circumstances of the crucifixion.* The pretended *Acta Pilati*, now presented to us in an altered form in the Gospel of Nicodemus, we know now to have been forged by some Christian, who, in order to make the story of the trial, death, and resurrection of Christ more credible and impressive, threw it into the form of a report made by Pilate to the Emperor Tiberius, amplifying the narrative substantially derived from the Gospels with all sorts of meretricious ornaments and fables.

The pretended epistolary correspondence of Christ with King Abgarus of Edessa, which Eusebius professes to give from the Syriac original,† is another striking instance of the facility with which everything edifying was assumed to be authentic. Abgarus, a petty potentate beyond the Euphrates, was ailing of some incurable malady; and hearing of the miraculous cures of Jesus, sent a messenger named Ananias with a letter, beseeching Jesus, whose deeds, he says, proclaimed him to be either the Son of God or God himself, to come and heal him, and to frustrate the enmity and treachery of the Jews by taking up his residence with him. Jesus accordingly wrote back by the messenger as follows:—"Blessed art thou, O Abgarus, who believest without seeing me. For it is written concerning me that they who see me shall not believe, in order that they who see me not may believe and be saved.‡ As to thy wish that I should come to thee, it is necessary that I should first fulfil all things here for which I am sent, and after fulfilling them be again received up to Him that sent me. And after I have been received up I will send thee one of my disciples who shall heal thy malady, and give life to thee and thine." Now we know that Christianity reached Edessa in the second

* *Apol.* 1, 35.

† *H. E.* 1, 13.

‡ Christ is here made to refer to passages in John's Gospel—xix. 39, xx. 29—as if already extant.

century, and can therefore easily understand how this event should be unhistorically referred back to the time of Christ; it is more difficult to comprehend how Eusebius could have been blind to the real nature of so clumsy a forgery; this Eusebius, the earliest historian of the Church, being, it should be observed, one of the chief authorities on whose testimony depends the reputed authenticity of the Gospels.

10. THE MOST ANCIENT TESTIMONIES TO THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS.

From these general remarks, indispensable by way of preface, let us pass to the most ancient testimonies to the existence, and in favour of the authenticity of our Gospels.* And thus much is certain, that towards the end of the second century after Christ, the same four Gospels as we still have are found recognised in the Church, and quoted in many ways as the writings of the Apostles and disciples of Apostles whose names they bear, by the three most eminent ecclesiastical teachers—Irenæus in Gaul, Clement in Alexandria, and Tertullian in Carthage. There were indeed always current a considerable number of other Gospels: there was a Gospel of the Hebrews and of the Egyptians, of Peter, of Bartholomew, of Thomas, of Matthew, and of the twelve Apostles as well, used not only by heretical parties, but sometimes appealed to by orthodox teachers; but these four were at that time, and from that time downwards, considered as the peculiarly reliable foundations on which the Christian faith rested.

Now if we ask, why just these four, neither more nor less, we are answered by Irenæus.† The Gospel is the pillar of

* Comp. especially Köstlin, *Origin and Composition of the Synoptic Gospels* (1853); and Hilgenfeld, *Canon and Criticism of the New Testament* (1836).

† Adv. Hæres. iii. 11, 8.

the Church, the Church is spread over the whole world, the world has four quarters, therefore it is fitting that there should be also four Gospels. Again, the Gospel is the divine breath of life, or wind of life, for men; now there are on earth four chief winds, therefore also four Gospels. Or, the creative word is enthroned upon the cherubim, the cherubim have four faces, therefore also the Word has given us a fourfold Gospel. Now this strange mode of proof is not indeed to be understood in the sense that the circumstances so stated constituted the reason why Irenæus adopted neither more nor fewer Gospels; on the contrary, these four had already achieved a position of pre-eminent credit in the circles of the Catholic Church, striving as it was after catholic unity, and it was this position, thus already given, which Irenæus sought to justify according to the spirit of his age; but it is precisely in this explanation that we recognise a spirit entirely alien to that of our own time—to that of intelligent or reasonable criticism.

But even independent of this, evidence, of which the date is a century later than the time at which the latest of the professed authors of our Gospels can possibly have lived, could not be satisfactory. We must search for older records of the origin of our Gospels. And in doing so it will be indispensable not only to separate the first three Gospels from the fourth, but also to examine each one of the former by itself.

Now as regards, in the first place, the Gospel of Matthew, Eusebius has preserved for us the following testimony of Papias, who in the first half of the second century was Bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, and carefully collected the traditions of the Apostles from the lips of the most ancient members of the Church.* "Matthew noted down in the Hebrew

* History of the Church, iii. 39, 16.

"language the speeches (of the Lord), and every one interpreted them as well as he could." That Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, that is, in the Aramaic dialect of that time, is repeated by the later teachers of the Church, with the addition which naturally follows, that he did so for the Christians in Palestine. This statement is still further narrowed by Eusebius, who says, that Matthew adopted this course when he was desirous of leaving the Hebrews to visit others, in order to compensate by a written document for his absence in person.* Hieronymus adds, "It is not known who translated this Gospel, originally written in Hebrew, into Greek."† Consequently the work which Papias attributes to Matthew was generally understood to be the original of our present Gospel of Matthew, and this was considered as a translation into Greek of the former by an unknown hand. Now here it is strange that Papias, in the passage quoted, which probably lies at the bottom of all other accounts, speaks only of speeches which Matthew‡ noted down; and Schleiermacher accordingly has taken him literally, and understood the Hebrew work of Matthew to have been not a complete Gospel, but only a collection of speeches.§ But when Schleiermacher went further, and understood by the interpretation, of which Papias says that every one performed it to the best of his ability, not translation but illustration of the *dicta* of Jesus, by adding the historical occasions on which they were spoken,—in this he certainly went too far. For when a man writing in Greek speaks of interpreting a Hebrew record, it is impossible to understand by this anything but translating. Besides, the completion of the speeches by narratives was not necessary, if Papias spoke of the

* History of the Church, iii. 24, 6.

† Vir. Illus. 3.

‡ τὰ λόγια.

§ On the Testimony of Papias to our two first Gospels. Works, Theology, ii. 361 ff.

speeches which Matthew recorded, not in an exclusive sense, but only meaning that together with the narratives they appeared to him to be the most important things. And that this was all he meant is clear from his testimony about Mark before quoted by Eusebius, where, after having spoken of the "words and deeds" of Christ, which the interpreter of Peter recorded, he calls this record immediately after a "collection of the speeches of the Lord." Still, Papias only bears witness to the composition by the Apostle Matthew of a Hebrew Gospel; he says nothing of our Greek Matthew being a translation of this; and in his expression, "every one translated it as well as he could," it appears to be implied that these translations differed from one another, and were rather paraphrases than translations. When therefore Hieronymus expresses himself to the effect that it is not known who translated Matthew's Gospel into Greek, he might have had every reason for going further, and admitting in general that it is not known whether our present Gospel of Matthew is a translation from the Hebrew at all, inasmuch as the character of its language suggests its having been originally composed in Greek rather than in Hebrew. For some time, indeed, Hieronymus spoke as if he had discovered the Hebrew original of Matthew, that is, in the so-called Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes, which also passed with other persons for the original Gospel of Matthew; but inasmuch as he subsequently translated this into Greek, which he would not have considered necessary if our Matthew had been already such a translation, he must have been convinced that this was not the case; and indeed the passages which he and others of the Fathers quote from that Hebrew Gospel either differ considerably from our Matthew, or are altogether unknown to him. It is indeed clear from these passages, which have in part the appearance of a later exaggeration, that the Gospel translated by Hieronymus was far from being the original Gospel of Matthew. On the contrary, if, according to the

tradition, it must be supposed to have any connection with it, it must have been rather a paraphrase of it of a later date than our present Gospel of Matthew.

And now we have reached the right point of view for the consideration of the Gospel. We see in different paraphrases an original stock, which might possibly, in accordance with the account of Papias, have come from an Apostle. One of these paraphrases is the Hebrew Gospel, another is our Matthew, others will meet us further on. And this paraphrasing of traditional gospel matter, which grew as time went on, was a continuous work, so that not only the so-called Gospel of the Hebrews appears at different times and among different parties in a different form; but even our Matthew shews clear traces of having come into existence not at once, but by degrees, and in consequence of repeated editions. But we need not go further in this direction until we have investigated the most ancient testimonies for the two other Gospels of the connected group.

The same Papias, then, to whom we owe the notice of the Gospel of Matthew, is quoted for the Gospel of Mark. As a tradition of John the Presbyter, a disciple of the Lord, though probably not an immediate one,* he informs us† that “Mark, “who was the interpreter of Peter, recorded accurately as far “as he remembered, but not in order, what Christ said and “did. He had not himself been a hearer of the Lord, or an “attendant upon him; but at a later period it is said had “stood in both those relations to Peter, who arranged his “lectures as occasion required, and not as if he wished to “make a collection of the speeches of the Lord. So that “Mark is not open to any censure if he recorded some things “as he had received them. For he had only one object in “view, which was not to omit or falsely represent anything

* Comp. Hilgenfeld, Gospels, p. 339, Remark 4.

† In Eusebius, Church History, iii. 35, 15.

"of what he had heard." This original notice of Papias is repeated more definitely by the Fathers of the Church, but so contradictorily that one sees at once that they had no certain or independent knowledge of their own about the matter. According to Irenæus,* for instance, Mark did not write down any records until after the death of the two Apostles, Peter and Paul; according to Clement of Alexandria,† on the contrary, he wrote his Gospel even while Peter was still preaching in Rome, at the request of Peter's hearers; and Peter, when he heard of it, neither helped nor hindered. On the other hand, Eusebius says,‡ that when Peter heard of it he was rejoiced at the zeal of the people, and sanctioned the reading of the written document to the congregations. In proof of this, Eusebius appeals to the same work of Clement out of which at a later period he quotes the statement just given above, that Peter did in no way concern himself in the matter. But full apostolical authority was desired for the Gospel, and it would not have been sufficient for this to place the composition of it at a period subsequent to the death of the Apostle, when the composer could no longer have questioned him; but supposing it to have been written during his lifetime, why should he have been so indifferent to it, and not, on the contrary, have commended it to the congregations as pressingly as it deserved? As we obviously have here before us accounts gradually arranged to meet certain wishes, we are simply driven back upon the statement of Papias, which we must now consider still more accurately.

He says that Mark recorded the speeches and acts of the Lord from recollection of the lectures of Peter, but *not in order*; and the question is, first, how this last expression is to be understood. If Papias meant, *not in the right order*,

* Adv. Hær. iii. 1, 1, in Eusebius, Church History, v. 8, 2.

† In Eusebius, Church History, vi. 14, 6.

‡ Church Hist. ii. 15, 2.

then the question is, what, in his opinion, the right order was? It is supposed that it was the order of the Gospel of St. John, which does indeed differ from that of Mark, as it does from that of all the synoptic Gospels; but the Gospel of John was, as we shall shortly see, not yet known to Papias, and would least of all be recognised by him as a standard for the others. On the other hand, he knew, as we have seen, a Hebrew Gospel of Matthew and Greek paraphrases of it: but the arrangement of Mark does not differ so essentially from that of our Greek Matthew, at all events that Papias would, on this account, have denied him the merit of the right order. On the whole, it would appear that when Papias explains the want of order in Mark from his dependence on the lectures of Peter, who may be supposed to have testified of Jesus only occasionally, he intends to refuse to his narrative the merit not only of the right order, but of any historical arrangement whatever. But this is as little wanting in the Gospel of Mark as in any other, and consequently Papias, if we are to understand his expression in this sense, could not have our present Gospel of Mark before him, but must have been speaking of a totally different work. Even in other respects the general character of our Gospel of Mark points not to any particular relation between the author of it and Peter, whose individuality does not come out at all more prominently in it than it does in Matthew, on the contrary less so, but throughout to the use of the latter, on whom however no writer who could draw for his matter on the lectures of Peter would have leaned so continually. Since, therefore, Papias gives us a description of the work of Mark inapplicable to our Gospel of Mark, and traces its character to a condition which that of our Gospel of Mark does not explain, we cannot from his evidence arrive at any conclusion with regard to our second Gospel.

As to the Gospel of Luke, we have no external evidence of so old a date. But it has a noticeable testimony to itself in

its preface (i. 1—4).^{*} In this the author says:—"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." From this preface we see, first, that at the time when the author of our third Gospel wrote, a considerable evangelical literature was already in existence, to which he referred from a critical point of view. In the second place, as he distinguishes the "many who had taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which were most surely believed among them," from those "who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," he appears not to be aware of any Gospel immediately composed by an Apostle; and, thirdly, inasmuch as he alleges as his means for surpassing his predecessors, not any exclusive source, like the teaching by an Apostle, but only the fact "that he has followed up, inquired into, all things accurately from the first," there is no appearance of our having here before us the companion of an Apostle, though the author of the third Gospel has from the earliest times been considered as such.

Immediately after the passage about Mark above quoted, Irenæus continues: "And Luke also, the companion of Paul, wrote down in a book the Gospel preached by the latter." In this case, again, as well as in that of the evidence of Papias about Mark, the supposition might occur to us that these words must refer to a totally different work; for that

^{*} Upon this preface compare Kostlin, *Origin and Composition of the Synoptic Gospels*, p. 132 ff.

the Gospel which Paul preached was neither that or like that which we now have, either in the third or any other Gospel, is certain, seeing that the matter neither of the apostolic preaching, nor of the most ancient Christian preaching generally, consisted of a detailed history of the life of Jesus, but of the short proof of his Messiahship from the Old Testament prophecies and of his resurrection from the dead, to which, according to circumstances, was added an explanation of the atoning power of his death, the narrative of the establishment of the last supper, the reminding of the hearers of this or that remarkable expression of Jesus. Least of all was Paul the man to give an historical turn to his lectures: it is scarcely to be supposed that he, as a late disciple, was acquainted with all the particular circumstances of Jesus' life, and moreover he seems to have laid but little weight upon them. And on this account, according to the evidence of Hieronymus,* several persons took care to assume that Luke received his Gospel not from Paul alone, who was not with Jesus in the flesh at all, but also from the other Apostles. And so in this case as well as in that of Mark we find the tranquillising assumption that Paul has taken corroborative notice of the Gospel of his companion. When, that is, in Rom. ii. 16, and 2 Tim. ii. 8, he says, "according to my "Gospel," this was at once referred to the Gospel of Luke, whereas this expression, so far from indicating any book whatever, is to be understood only of the oral preaching of the Apostle.

Thus, then, the relation of the third Gospel to Paul, as well as that of the second to Peter, resolves itself into nothing. The case, however, of the former is somewhat different, as the assumption is founded not merely on the statements of the Fathers of the Church, but also on the contents of the book itself. It is well known that the third Gospel is only

* Dir. Vir. ill. 7.

the first part of a larger whole, of which the "Acts of the Apostles" forms the second; and in this second part the author seems not only sometimes to come forward as the companion of Paul, a point on which we shall speak below, but there is also apparent an especial interest on the part of the writer in this Apostle, and the place he filled in the original Christian Church. But also in the Gospel, when we come to speak of its internal characteristics, we shall be compelled to recognise the same tendency; so that up to this point, at least, it seems that more importance is to be assigned to the relation which ecclesiastical tradition attributes to the third Gospel in reference to Paul, than to the personal one to Peter, which it attributes to the second.

11. ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE FOR THE THREE FIRST GOSPELS.

Looking for other traces of these three first Gospels in the most ancient times of the Christian Church,* we might suppose, as others have done, that besides the above-mentioned expression of the Apostle Paul, a reference to our Gospels may be recognised in other passages also of the New Testament. But the coincidence, undoubtedly striking, between 1 Cor. xi. 23—25 and Luke xxii. 19 and the following verses in the narrative of the institution of the Supper, is not to be explained on the supposition that the Apostle used the Gospel, but conversely by the fact that the Evangelist took his account from the Epistle of the Apostle with which he was acquainted. On the other hand, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (v. 7) there is, undoubtedly, a reference to a scene which occurs in all the synoptic Gospels, the Agony in Geth-

* Compare on this subject, besides the larger works of Köstlin and Hilgenfeld, Zeller, the Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles, critically investigated, translated into English.

semane. The expressions, however, are so general that it is impossible to decide whether the author of the Epistle, the date of which, moreover, is uncertain, drew upon one of our Gospels for his information, or only upon the current evangelical tradition. Quite as little should I be inclined to doubt that in the second Epistle of Peter (i. 17 and following verses) the transfiguration of Jesus on the mountain is meant, and in this instance the quotation of the words spoken by the voice from heaven being identical with those in Matthew, makes it probable either that they were taken from him or from the source used by him; but the second Epistle of Peter is one of the latest of our canonical writings, so that the evidence scarcely carries us to a date earlier than the end of the second century after Christ.

Next to the canonical writings of our New Testament, we come to those of the so-called Apostolical Fathers,* a group of writings by the alleged disciples of the Apostles, but whose authenticity is more than doubtful, and which, therefore, are but little adapted to give us any sure ground in the question as to the origin of our Gospels. It is undoubted that in these writings, the pretended Epistles of Barnabas, of Clement the Roman, of Ignatius and Polycarp, as well as in the so-called "Shepherd" of Hermas, there are found sometimes echoes of, sometimes references to, expressions and narratives which are known to us from the three first Gospels. By *echoes* I mean instances of agreement between these writings and our Gospels, in which, without any mention of the expression being one of Christ, or of its being anywhere recorded, the same words, or strikingly similar ones, are used; or things are mentioned which we also find in our Gospels. When, for instance, the pretended Ignatius writes to the Romans, chap. vi., "It is better for me to die to Christ than to exercise dominion over the ends of the

* Compare Hilgenfeld, *Apostolical Fathers* (1853).

"earth, for what profits it a man if he wins the whole world
 "but loses his own soul?" or, when Barnabas, among other
 expressions which partly find an echo in the Epistles of Paul,
 partly are without parallels in the New Testament, has also
 the following, "Give to every one who asks" (chap. xix.), it
 is impossible to mistake that the former writer had in his
 mind the expression of Christ, which we read Matthew xvi.
 26; the latter that in Luke vi. 30; Matthew v. 42; but that
 these expressions were taken directly out of our Gospels, nay,
 whether they were taken from written sources at all, and not
 from oral tradition, is a question which cannot at all events
 be decided from allusions of this sort considered by them-
 selves. And even these express references to *dicta* of Christ
 do not lead us further. When Polycarp, in his letter to the
 Philippians (chap. vii.), says, "Pray the all-seeing God not
 "to lead you into temptation, as the Lord has said, 'The
 "spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak,'" neither the
 reference to Christ's exhortation (Matt. xxvi. 41), nor the
 allusion to the clause in the Lord's Prayer, can be mistaken;
 but it is doubtful whether the two expressions came to the
 writer from the same source as to ourselves. At all events,
 written sources of some sort must be supposed when Bar-
 nabas (chap. iv.) quotes the expression, "Many are called
 "but few chosen," adding the words, "as it is written;" or
 when the author of the second Epistle of Clement, after
 bringing forward a passage of Isaiah, used in the Epistle to
 the Galatians, continues (chap. ii.), "And another scripture
 "says, 'I am not come to call the righteous but the sinners;'"
 but in the first case by the word *scripture*, there is no doubt
 that it is the apocryphal book of Ezra* that is meant; and
 in the second instance the quotation of an evangelical record
 as (sacred) scripture, together with an Old Testament book,

* 4 Esr. viii. 3. Comp. Volkmar, Introduction to the Apocrypha, ii. 290;
 Hilgenfeld, Prophets Ezra and Daniel, p. 70.

is one of the proofs of a very late origin of the Epistle; to say nothing of the fact that we are unable here also to pronounce with certainty whether the written source used is really one of our own Gospels (Matt. xx. 16, xxii. 14, ix. 13).

But this becomes very questionable, indeed, when we observe that the expressions of Christ, as quoted by these Apostolical Fathers, sometimes differ essentially from the corresponding ones in our Gospels. We say nothing here of the second Epistle of Clement, who, in the second half of the second century, quotes expressions of Jesus, which, unknown as they are to our canonical Gospels, were probably found in the apocryphal Gospel of the Egyptians. But even the first Epistle of Clement, supposed to belong to the beginning of the second century, in an exhortation to humility and gentleness (chap. xiii.), quotes words of the Lord Jesus, "which he spoke, teaching moderation and patience, thus, "that is, he spoke: 'Be merciful that you may receive "mercy; forgive that you may be forgiven; as you do, so shall "it be done to you; as you give, so shall it be given to you; "as you judge, so shall you be judged; as you are kind, so "shall you receive kindness; with what measure you measure, "so shall it be measured to you.'" Here the allusion to Matt. vii. 1* and following verses is unmistakeable; but the passage in its greatly expanded form differs so much from that in Matthew, that it cannot well have been taken from our Matthew, or even from Luke, who, in the parallel passage, vi. 37, and the following verses, likewise expands that of Matthew, though in a different way; and thus another evangelical record appears to have given it in a different form, from which the author of the Epistle of Clement took it; and from him, probably, the pretended Polycarp, chap. ii. Few individual evangelical facts are found in these Epistles, but most in those which bear the name of Ignatius, but

* Judge not, that ye be not judged.

which did not, in fact, come into existence before the middle of the second century, where we cannot be surprised to find over and above the general notice of Jesus as the Son of God and David from the Virgin, of his passion and atoning death, his resurrection and ascension, the description in particular of the star at his birth (Eph. xix.), the motive for his baptism in the purpose of fulfilling all righteousness (Smyrn. i.), the awakening of the Old Testament saints at his resurrection (Magn. ix.), the eating and drinking with his disciples after the resurrection (the same, chap. iii.), of which the three first points remind us of Matt. ii. 1 and following verses, iii. 15, xxvii. 52; the last-mentioned of Luke xxiv. 39, and Acts of the Apostles x. 41.

In Justin Martyr* we gain firmer ground, inasmuch as the genuineness of his most important writings is exposed to no doubt, and the period at which he flourished as an author was, at all events, that of the reign of Antoninus Pius, 138—161 A.D. In him we find, first and foremost, what we miss almost entirely in the Apostolical Fathers, namely, reference to written sources for the speeches and events in the life of Jesus recorded by him. But neither does he say that these sources were our Gospels or any of them. He usually calls his sources, “*Memorabilia* of the Apostles,” using the Greek word, which was undoubtedly known to him from Xenophon’s “*Memorabilia*” of Socrates; he remarks that these “*Memorabilia*” are called Gospels, but he does so in a passage† which has been attacked as a later interpolation; and as he speaks elsewhere of the Gospels in the singular, there have not been wanting those who, bearing in mind that in the case of Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* the plural indicates

* Compare on this subject Hilgenfeld, *Critical Examination of the Gospels of Justin* (1810); Volkmar, *Period of Justin Martyr*, critically examined, in Zeller’s *Theological Annual*, 1815, p. 227 ff., 412 ff.

† The passages of Justin are found in every Introduction to the New Testament; I therefore do not refer to them in detail.

only one work, understood him to speak of only one Gospel, while others have supposed that by his word "Gospel" in the singular a collection of Gospels was meant. He says more definitely of these Memorabilia that they were composed by the Apostles of Jesus and their companions, which agrees with the Church notion of the origin of our Gospels; but how he knew this, and whether it is not merely the obvious supposition that Memorabilia of Jesus could only be composed by those who were about his person, we do not learn.

Now as regards, first, the narrative substance of the accounts used by Justin, we see coming out from the obscurity in which we have hitherto been involved, nearly the same historical features as we find in our own Gospels, the genealogy from David, or even from Adam, annunciation by angels, and supernatural conception, Magi, and the flight to Egypt: then comes the Baptist as forerunner, baptism and temptation of Jesus; choice and mission of the disciples, miracles and ministry, friendship with publicans, and attack by Pharisees; lastly, annunciation of mode of death, entrance into Jerusalem, purification of the Temple, institution of the Supper, arrest and crucifixion, resurrection and ascension. But with all this, Justin describes some things which we do not find in our Gospels. He makes Jesus to be born in a cave at Bethlehem, afterwards to be of assistance to his father in his carpenter's and wheelwright's work, kindles a fire on the occasion of his baptism in the Jordan, when the voice from heaven echoes the words in Ps. ii. 7, "Thou art my "Son, this day have I begotten thee." The statement also that after the crucifixion of Jesus, all his disciples abandoned and denied him, is an exaggeration of the account given in our Evangelists of this circumstance, almost to the same extent as the statement in the Epistle of Barnabas, that they had been, before the call by Jesus, the most accursed sinners. Of these discrepancies, some indeed may be looked

upon as Justin's own combinations, without supposing the existence of separate sources of information: as for instance, when we read in our Mark (vi. 3) the question of the Nazarene, not merely in the form found in Matthew, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" but in the words, "Is not this the carpenter?" he might possibly draw the conclusion himself, that the son helped the father in the work of his calling. In the same manner, when, in opposition to the correct account of Luke, he changes Quirinus from a Prefect of Syria into a Governor of Judæa, this may easily have been an oversight, into which he may have been misled by the circumstance of a Jewish census being attributed to this officer. So also we might only consider it as Justin's own explanation of the expression in Matthew, when he makes the Eastern Magi come expressly from Arabia. We may remark, however, that when he repeats this notice no less than ten times, and also that the Baptist settled on the Jordan at least three times, this perseverance appears to point to a particular and separate source: an assumption to which the cave in Bethlehem, and the fire in the Jordan, of themselves force upon us. And when we learn from Epiphanius* that the Gospel of the Hebrews, of which the Ebionites made use, spoke likewise of a great light which shone around the place at the baptism of Jesus, and that in the voice from heaven, after the words, "My Son, in whom I am well pleased," which we read in our Gospels, it also contained the others, "this day have I begotten thee," which we found in Justin, it is an obvious supposition that the Gospel from which he took these traits may have been an edition of that of the Hebrews.

The speeches of Jesus, which Justin gives after his Apostolical Memorabilia, shew more agreement with our Gospels than his narratives of fact. There is, indeed, only in very

* Hæres. xxx. 13.

few cases a literal agreement, but the discrepancies are frequently such as might be made, not merely by one who writes from memory, but also by one who copies carelessly from a book before him. It is only when, in the instance of any such discrepancy, either Justin, in different passages, is consistent with himself, or the same deviating form is found in other writers also, that the supposition of a source other than our Gospels gains greater probability. Thus it would be of itself of no importance that Justin quotes the passage from the Sermon on the Mount (Luke vi. 37), "Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father in heaven is merciful," with the interpolation, "Be *kind* and merciful, as your Father in heaven is kind and merciful." But his doing this twice, each time in separate works, makes it at once more probable that he read this speech in the authority from which he took it really in this form. So also when we find the expression of Jesus (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22), "None knows the Son but the Father, and no one knows the Father but the Son, and to whom the Son will reveal him," quoted in Justin with the double variation, that, in the first place, the knowledge of the Father through the Son precedes that of the Son through the Father; and, in the second place, the *knowledge** is put into the past tense,—this might seem to be a free quotation from our Matthew and Luke; but when we see that the speech is quoted with exactly the same variations, and repeatedly so, in the Homilies of Clement, an apocryphal writing from the Ebionitish circle,† we are compelled here also to assume a special source. And Justin not unfrequently combines together speeches which, in our Gospels, are found separate: the speech, however, which he ascribes to Jesus, "Where I find you, there will I judge you," for anything resembling which we look in vain in our Gospels, can hardly be explained as a mere combination of the speeches of Jesus,

* οὐδεὶς ἔγνω, instead of ἐπιγινώσκει, Apol. i. 63.

† Homil. xvii. 4, xviii. 4, 11, 13, 20.

Matt. xxiv. 37 and following verses, Luke xii. 35 and following verses, xvii. 26 and following verses, but seems to have been taken from elsewhere.

If we look now still more closely to the relation between the quotations of Justin and our own individual Gospels (reserving always the fourth), we shall find the main agreement to exist between these quotations and our own Matthew. The speeches of Jesus, as quoted by Justin, generally resemble most the form in which the same speeches are given in Matthew, and even those speeches and events which are found exclusively in Matthew are again repeated in Justin. Still, though less frequently, the agreement with Luke also in some passages is not to be mistaken. The long barrenness of Elizabeth, the taxation, the entrance of Jesus on his ministry in his thirtieth year, the sending out of the seventy disciples, the power granted to them to tread on snakes and scorpions (only that Justin adds centipedes), the sweat falling in drops at Gethsemane, the sending of the prisoner by Pilate to Herod—all these particulars are mentioned by Justin, and in part in exactly the same words and expressions as in Luke. And he endeavours, in those points in which the two Evangelists start from different suppositions, to reconcile them together. Thus, notwithstanding the announcement of Mary's pregnancy by the angel Gabriel, as described in Luke, he represents Joseph as being perplexed by the condition of his betrothed, and only satisfied by a dream, as Matthew, knowing nothing of an annunciation, finds it necessary to do; then, following Luke, he makes Joseph be only accidentally brought by the taxation from his dwelling-place Nazareth to Bethlehem, and again, in his return from Egypt, entertain the plan of settling at Bethlehem, where, according to the taxation of Luke, he had nothing more to do, unless, according to Matthew, he had always lived there. The reason of Justin's agreement with Mark appearing more seldom, is to be found in the circumstance that Mark has so little

peculiarly his own; but a trace of peculiarity, even on his part, is to be found in the name of Boanerges, or sons of thunder, applied to the sons of Zebedee, which Justin mentions, and which Mark alone of our Evangelists (iii. 17) adduces.

Now, if we ask how this form of the evangelical matter in Justin may be explained, and what follows from it in reference to our Gospels, the assumption that Justin had at hand our Gospels and nothing else, but quoted them freely, and filled them up from his own notions, or the current legend—this assumption is quite as unsatisfactory for the explanation of the case before us as the opposite one, that he was not acquainted with our Gospels at all, but made use of a Gospel which, notwithstanding considerable agreement with them, was nevertheless distinct from them. For that he must have had several Gospels becomes at once probable, from the circumstance that his statements are sometimes reconciliatory, and that of these Gospels, one was essentially identical with our Matthew, another with our Luke, as shewn by the comparison just made; but that, besides these, he must also have had one or more other Gospels, has likewise appeared from what has been said above. We see, therefore, about the middle of the second century, the evangelical matter reduced to different versions, which in part correspond to our present Gospels, in part present discrepancies from them, which, like the cave at Bethlehem and the fire at the Jordan, place before our eyes the still unextinguished impulse of evangelical legendary poetry.

The case is the same with the evangelical quotations of the Homilies of Clement, an Ebionitish work, which may be from one to two decades later than Justin's chief works. Those quotations also agree most frequently with Matthew, more rarely with Luke and Mark, while they at the same time, by the frequent repetition of some particular expression, as, for instance, the speech of Christ, which also frequently recurs

in the ancient Fathers of the Church, "Be shrewd dealers,"* point to some other source which was probably used by Justin as well. A number of Gospels, and among them without doubt our Matthew and Luke, were known to the heathen philosopher Celsus,† who wrote against the Christians about the middle of the second century, and he used their differences from one another, *e.g.* in the account of the resurrection, as a proof against the truth of Christianity. When in doing so he expresses himself to the effect that some of the Christians take the liberty of re-coining and re-modelling the original form of the Gospel, in order to explain away the contradictions in it, there is, certainly, apart from its acrimonious spirit, much that is true in the assertion. For the three first Gospels at least will, the more we examine them, appear to be modifications and different versions of the same original matter; and even the interests, sometimes apologetic, sometimes dogmatic, for which these modifications have been undertaken, will not always be quite concealed from us.

With regard to the order in which our Gospels were written, we have, from Clement of Alexandria, as a tradition of the Heads of the Church, the notice that those with the genealogies, our Matthew and Luke, were written before the others,‡ and we shall find that this account agrees with their internal character. Origen makes Matthew write first, and then, differing in this from Clement, Luke after Mark; but in reference to this statement we cannot feel sure whether the canonical arrangement of the Gospels, occasioned most probably by nothing but the supposed relative rank in the Church of the Apostles Peter and Paul, may not have influenced the writer in making it. But these two writers agree in declaring the Gospel of John to have been the last

* Clem. Homil. ii. 51, and frequently.

† Orig. c. Cels. ii. 27.

‡ Eusebius, History of the Church, vi. 25, 5 ff.

written, and in doing so certainly coincide with historical truth.*

Thus from all these discussions the following conclusion results with reference to the three first Gospels. Even if we allow the validity of Papias' testimony about Matthew and Mark as authors of Gospels, against the credibility of which moreover, as we soon shall see, it is still possible to protest, still, neither our first Gospel, in the form in which we have it, is the work of the Apostle Matthew, nor the second that of the apostolical assistant Mark. Neither are these the works of which Papias speaks; and while we are ignorant of the relation between our Gospel of Matthew and the actual work of the Apostle, while we do not know what additions this latter may have received, what modifications it may have undergone, so likewise with regard to our Gospel of Mark, we cannot tell even whether it had any connection at all with the work of Mark of which Papias speaks. Of the composer of the Gospel of Luke we know from his own preface that he wrote somewhat late, and as a secondary author who worked up more ancient sources; and to this statement, as we shall see, the passages in the Acts of the Apostles in which a companion of Paul appears to speak, do not stand in contradiction. We do not find certain traces of the existence of our three first Gospels in their present form until towards the middle of the second century, consequently not for a whole century after the time when the chief events of the history contained in them took place, and no one can reasonably maintain that this period is too short to make the intrusion of unhistorical elements into all parts of the Evangelical History possible or conceivable.

* Ibid. vi. 14, vii. 25, 6. Comp. iii. 24, 7.

12. EVIDENCE FOR THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

This conclusion, then, has been pretty generally admitted on all sides where criticism is not entirely banished from the province of theology. And so much the more firmly has the fourth Gospel been maintained as the work of an apostolical eye-witness, as the sure ground for the history of original Christianity. They must, indeed, be mainly internal grounds on which such a confidence rests; for, as regards the external evidence,* it would be well for the cause of the fourth Gospel if it were similarly circumstanced with that of the three first. Papias, who says of Matthew at least thus much, that he composed a Hebrew Gospel, though he does not state in what relation this stood to our own Greek one, says, so far as we know, nothing of a Gospel written by the Apostle John. We know, indeed, only from Eusebius what Papias said; but as it is part of the plan of his Church History to collect the most ancient testimony for the writings of the New Testament, and as he brings forward Papias as evidence for the first Epistle of John, his silence with regard to any testimony of Papias for the Gospel of John amounts to nearly the same thing as the silence of Papias himself. And this silence of Papias about John as the author of a Gospel is the more important, as he not only expressly assures us that he eagerly investigated the traditions about John; but, as Bishop of Asia Minor, and an acquaintance of Polycarp, the disciple of John, might naturally have some accurate information about the Apostle, who passed his last years in Ephesus.

But Papias, it seems, is still to be made to bear witness for the Gospel of John, and that whether he will or not, and

* Comp. on this point Bretschneider, *Probabilia*, p. 178 ff. Baur, *Critical Examination of the Canonical Gospels*, p. 349 ff. Zeller, *External Testimony as to the Existence and Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, *Theological Annual*, 1845, p. 159 ff.; and his further remarks in the same, 1847, p. 136 ff. Hilgenfeld, *Gospels*, p. 344 ff. *The Gospels of Justin, &c.*, p. 292 ff.

indirectly if not directly. In the above-mentioned evidence of this writer for the first Epistle of John, inasmuch as this Epistle, taking all internal indications into account, must be ascribed to the same author as the Gospel, evidence for this last is also supposed to be included. The evidence for the Epistle rests upon the statement in Eusebius,* that Papias used proofs out of it as well as out of the first Epistle of Peter. Now if we were forced to understand this in the sense that Papias quoted passages which we now read in the first Epistle of John, expressly as declarations of the Apostle John, this would certainly be evidence given by him for this Epistle. On the other hand, supposing Eusebius only to have concluded, from the similarity of this or that expression or thought in the writings of Papias to a corresponding one in the first Epistle of John, that Papias was acquainted with this Epistle, and must have recognised it, he might as easily have been mistaken in this conclusion, as theologians in the present day are mistaken in similar conclusions. Meanwhile, even if we take the statement of Eusebius in its strictest sense, and suppose that Papias really quoted the first Epistle of John as a writing of the Apostle John, still the second point is by no means proved, that the Epistle and Gospel must have had the same composer. The connection, indeed, in style and tone, is such as in certain main ideas is not to be mistaken; but side by side with this there runs a very decided difference, and the thoughts and expressions of the Epistle betray a mind notably weaker than that of the Evangelist.

But the fourth Gospel is supposed to carry within itself incomparably stronger evidence than that in Papias or the first Epistle of John, of its apostolical origin. This is contained, it is said, in the supplement to its conclusion, xxi. 24, where the author or authors of this concluding statement

* History of the Church, iii. 39, 17.

say, "He," *i.e.* the disciple who was spoken of immediately before, and who was described as the beloved disciple of Jesus, "is the same who bears witness of these things, and "has written this; and these, the authors of this addition, "know that his witness is true;" only those, it is said, could speak thus who were personally acquainted with the Apostle, and as such were known to the community of Ephesus, in which the Gospel first appeared, as, for instance, Aristion and the Presbyter John; we have, therefore, here such an attestation of credibility as only the most extreme historical scepticism could require.* Such we should certainly have, if the authors of that supplement had named themselves as acquaintances of the Apostle, and we had no reason to doubt their pretensions. But they have not so named themselves; nay, in all probability a totally different person here speaks from the author of this Gospel, or at least of this concluding chapter; and Zeller is certainly right when he says that the evidence is worth nothing, whether it comes from the Evangelist or not; for that in the first case it is only the writer's evidence in his own favour, and therefore devoid of all power of proof, and in the latter, it is suspicious as being the guarantee of an interpolater.

We may see, in the case of a similar supplement, what ought to be the conditions under which such evidence is given, if it is to prove anything. In the introduction to the eighth book of the Gallic war, the writer says, "I have" (here the passage is indeed corrupt, but this much is clear, that he means to say he has) "completed our friend Cæsar's "Commentaries on his achievements in Gaul;" and further on he speaks of the manner in which he and others like him admire the work on far different grounds from the general public, since they are aware, not only as the public is, how admirably, but also how quickly and how easily Cæsar wrote

* Tholuck, *Credibility of the Evangelical History*, p. 276.

the work. Now it is true that here, likewise, the finisher of the work and witness to its authenticity does not name himself, but he addresses himself to Balbus, a confidential friend of Cæsar; his plain speaking of "the Commentaries of our friend Cæsar," his definite declaration, "we know how easily and how quickly he wrote," differs from the whisper of the writer of the continuation of John, with its "disciple who bears witness of these things," and "we know that his witness is true," very much to the disadvantage of the latter. And when the MSS., agreeing with a statement in Suetonius,* name as the composer of that supplement, A. Hirtius, who, having been a sincere friend of Cæsar in the lifetime of the latter, became a General of the Republic, and fell at Mutina a year after his murder, such evidence would, indeed, of itself suffice to prove to us that Cæsar was the author of the seven first books on the Gallic war; but at the same time, the contrast makes it palpable that we have, in fact, no proof at all in favour of John as the author of the Gospel in that which is supposed to be implied by the passage, xxi. 24.

The value of another piece of evidence from the New Testament, adduced for the Gospel of John, may be seen at once from a former observation. The second Epistle of Peter is brought forward in corroboration of the synoptic account of the Transfiguration in the mountain, and also of the truth of the prophecy of the mode of Peter's death, in the chapter appended to the Gospel of John (xxi. 18). The supposed author of the Epistle (i. 14) says that he knows he must soon put off this tabernacle, as the Lord Jesus revealed to him. It may be admitted that in this passage reference is made to the Gospel of John; but it is certain, independently of this, that the fourth Gospel was in existence, and recognised in the Church towards the end of the second century, and the date of the second Epistle of Peter is not earlier than

* Julius, 56.

this. But when, besides this, certain passages of the Gospel of Mark have been appealed to, as having a resemblance so striking to passages in that of John, that they are to be explained only on the supposition of the use of the latter by the author of the former; even they who have made this appeal have been candid enough to admit that any one else might explain the resemblance on the converse supposition* that the composer of the fourth Gospel made use of the Gospel of Mark. To the consideration of this point we will return hereafter.

Now as regards the works of the Apostolical Fathers, that of Ignatius alone comes properly under consideration.† In his Epistles, some passages are found which have been considered as echoes of expressions in the fourth Gospel; as when he calls the flesh of Christ the Bread of Heaven and of Life, his blood a Heavenly drink, himself the door to the Father; or when of the Spirit he says, that he knows whence he cometh and whither he goeth, and that he punishes that which is hidden‡. But even if these expressions were not to be explained out of the ecclesiastical language of the time, still the date of the composition of the Epistle of Ignatius does not fall earlier than the middle of the second century; and if the Gospel of John had been recognised as Apostolical in the Church since the end of the first, its influence upon this and other writings of the second century must have been incomparably greater, and have declared itself in more ways than by such superficial echoes.

This is also true to the full extent of Justin Martyr, who has

* Bleek, Contributions to Evangelical Criticism, p. 200 ff.

† The fact that in the so-called Epistle of Polycarp, no reference is found to the fourth Gospel, would indeed be conclusive against the Johannic origin of the latter, only upon the assumption that the Epistle was really by Polycarp, the disciple of John. It is, however, remarkable, supposing it to have been written shortly after his martyrdom, and falsely attributed to him.

‡ Ad Rom. 7; ad Philad. vii. 9; comp. Joh. iii. 8, vi. 32 ff., x. 9, xvi. 8.

numerous and unmistakeable coincidences with the three first Evangelists, and only a few, and those doubtful, with the Gospel of John. In the introductions, indeed, to the New Testament we find above thirty such coincidences brought forward; but the overwhelming number of these rather authorises the conclusion—as Justin’s circle of ideas coincided so far with that of the fourth Gospel, then, if he knew it and recognised it as apostolical, references to it incomparably more decisive must certainly have been found in him. For Justin is acquainted with the doctrine of the Logos, and understands by it, as John also does, the intermediate essence between God and the creation; but that appellation as applied to this essence is, with him, only one among many, as he also calls it the glory or wisdom of God, and angel or messenger, leader (of the angels). With this is connected the fact, that in Justin the Logos, although begotten by God in an exceptionally peculiar manner, is generally called only the first-born, and the only-begotten only in reference to the passage in Ps. xxii. 19 ff.; elsewhere, also, the servant of God. We see accordingly that in Justin the idea of the Logos was in part less definite, in part less exalted, than in the fourth Gospel. And thus, on the other hand, it cannot have been in the Gospel that Justin found the conceptions, so frequent in his writings, of the procession or coming forth of the Logos from the Father, but he must have taken them from elsewhere—from, that is, the philosophy of the period, as it was shaped by the ideas of Philo. In Justin, indeed, as well as in John, the Logos is the divine principle in Christ; on the other hand, the doctrine of the Logos is not in him so sharply separated from that of the Holy Spirit as it is in John, nor is the term Paraclete,* which in the fourth Gospel is so remarkable as the name given by Jesus to the Spirit to be sent to his followers, found at all in Justin.

* παράκλητος. Luther, Comforter; better, Mediator.

If, in the next place, we investigate the passages from which an acquaintance on the part of Justin with the Gospel of John is usually inferred, the coincidence, in so far as it is not obviously accidental, may in most cases be sufficiently explained by the obvious supposition, that both sides took, from a common source, the religious philosophy of Alexandria and the Jewish Christian typology of the time. In point of fact, the only passage of importance is that in the first Apology of Justin, in which it is said, "For Christ said, if 'you are not born again you will not come into the kingdom of heaven; but that it is impossible to return into the bodies of those from whom we were born is evident to all.'"^{*} Here the reference to the passage from the dialogue of Jesus with Nicodemus (John iii. 3—5), appears to be unmistakeable and undeniable. We find also the first part of the passage quoted in the Homilies of Clement, with the words, "If ye 'are not born again with living water in the name of the 'Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, you will not come into 'the kingdom of heaven.'"[†] And here we may remark the variation that in Justin, as well as in the Homilies, instead of the expression in John, "Be born from above," the not exactly synonymous one, "Be born again," is used; instead of that in John, "kingdom of God," "kingdom of heaven" is used; instead of "if one," "if you;" and instead of "can see" or "enter," "you will," or "may, enter." The three last forms of expression, in particular the concluding one, which is exactly the same in the two writers, but differs from that in John, is also found in Matt. xviii. 3, where Jesus, on being questioned by the disciples as to the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, places a child in the midst, with the words, "Verily I say unto you (as in John, 'Verily, 'verily, I say unto thee'), except ye be converted, and become 'as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of

^{*} Apol. i. 61.

[†] Homil. xi. 26.

"heaven." It is plain that we have here before us the same expression in different forms; the undertaking that is impossible for men is represented in Matthew as becoming like children, in Justin as being born again, in the words of Clement as being born again by baptism, in John as being born from above by the Holy Ghost. The contrasting of this spiritual birth with the corporeal naturally followed, and we actually find in the Homilies of Clement, as an introduction to that passage in Justin, soon afterwards as a speech handed down from the Apostles, an illustration of this relation, with regard to which it is easy to suppose that the notice about the impossibility of a real return into the mother's womb might belong to it. Now, if it was, as it may have been, the Hebrew Gospel which originally contained this illustration, Justin's coincidence in it with the fourth Gospel is explained without the necessity of assuming a direct use of the latter by the former, by supposing that both took from a common source.

A strong proof for the early existence of the fourth Gospel was supposed to have been gained in a work lately discovered, the so-called *Philosophumena* of Origen, inasmuch as it was considered evident from this work that the most ancient Gnostics were acquainted with and used the Gospel.* Now it is true that expressions indisputably in John, as in i. 3, iii. 5, are brought forward from an Ophitic work; but how old this work was we are not told, and do not know. But when in the same work it is said of the Gnostic Basilides, "and this, "says he, is what is said in the Gospels, That was the true "light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," (John i. 9), Basilides, about 125 A.D., seems to have already known and recognised the Gospel of John. But the formula of quotation, "he says," or "says he," in the *Philosophumena*

* On this compare Zeller, on the quotations from the fourth Gospel in the *Philosophumena* Origenis: *Theol. Jahrb.* 1853, p. 444 ff.

of Origen, is a very comprehensive one, as it also stands where no author at all, or where several have been named before. For instance, the description of the Gnostic system of the Valentinians is opened by the pseudo-Origen with the words, "Valentine, and Heracleon, and Ptolemy, and their entire school say;" and then in the sequel he goes on, "says he" and "say they," all mixed up together; so that we see that the "he" is that writer of a school whose work the author is just using at the time, but what writer, whether the founder or one of his disciples and followers, we do not learn. Valentine's acquaintance, indeed, with the Gospel of John, and consequently its existence about the middle of the second century, is supposed to be confirmed even independently of that evidence. For Tertullian says that Valentine appears to use a perfect instrument (Testament).^{*} But is Tertullian the careful investigator who could be trusted to have distinguished more accurately than the pseudo-Origen between the founder and the school? The contrary is known to every one acquainted with his writings; and when he says that it only appears to him that Valentine had a complete Testament, we shall do well to take this for what it is worth, and no more. Thus he speaks of Marcion too, although with some uncertainty, as having rejected the Gospel of John, consequently as having been acquainted with it;[†] but this Gnostic would hardly have held by the Gospel of Luke, out of which he had to reject so much to make it available for his purpose, if he had had before him, in the Gospel of John, a Gospel much more closely allied to his anti-Jewish Dualism. Meanwhile, as regards Valentine, his acquaintance with the fourth Gospel is supposed to be proved from this, that he designated his most eminent Æons with names which, like Logos, Only-begotten, Life, Grace, Truth, &c., are taken from

^{*} De præscript. hæret. 38.

[†] Adv. Marcion, iv. 3, 5; De carne Christi, iii.

the Prologue of John. If this were so, how singular it is that Irenæus, where he is giving an account of the passages in the New Testament on which the Valentinians rested their doctrine of *Æons*,* brings forward many from the Synoptics and from Paul, but none from John, and that it is only in a supplement about Ptolemy, and not before, that passages also from John are brought into notice! For that this late disciple of Valentine was acquainted with the Gospel of John as an apostolical writing, we know from his Epistle to Flora, and another member of the school, Heracleon, wrote the first commentary upon it; but it is scarcely possible that either of them can have written before the last decade of the second century.

The same is the case with the Montanists, who are supposed to have taken their idea of the Paraclete from the Gospel of John, and consequently to guarantee likewise its earlier existence. But in the writings of the Montanists, if we look at the account given by Eusebius† of the most ancient dealings of the Church with those religionists, neither is the term Paraclete found (but simply Spirit), nor any reference to the fourth Gospel. This sect, therefore, as well as that of the Valentinians, appears originally to have arisen without any reference to the Gospel of John, not yet in existence; but when the Gospel came out, during the Gnostic-Montanistic movement, to have eagerly seized upon and profited by it.

13. RECOGNITION AND REJECTION OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN.

About this time, however, the date of the later Gnostics and Montanists, we find the Gospel of John known and recognised. In the conclusion of the Homilies of Clement,‡

* Adv. hæres. i. 8, 1—4.

† Church History, v. 16—19.

‡ Homil. xix. 22. Comp. Volkmar, A newly-discovered Testimony for the Gospel of John; Theolog. Jahrb. 1854, p. 441 ff.

only lately discovered, allusion is undoubtedly made to the account of the man who was born blind, John ix. ; perhaps, also, in another passage,* to John x. 3 : we shall speak below of an expression of Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, which assumes the existence of the fourth Gospel ; and also in the other passage of Apollinaris, where it is said of Christ, "He who was pierced in his sacred side, he who poured out from his side the two means of atonement, water and blood, *i.e.* the Logos and the Spirit,"† there is contained an allusion to the passage 1 John v. 6 ff., or John xix. 34, or both. The contemporary Apologists, Tatian and Athenagoras, also refer, though without naming it, unmistakeably to the fourth Gospel ; and at last Theophilus of Antioch (about A.D. 180) quotes it in due form with the words,‡ "Therefore, the Holy Scriptures and all inspired writers teach us, among whom John says, 'In the beginning was the Word,' &c." But how he knows that the Gospel, whose first words he quotes, was composed by the Apostle John, Theophilus does not inform us. And it is singular that even Irenæus, who in his younger years had known Polycarp, and had heard him speak of his intercourse with John, and of which the latter had told him about the Lord, says nothing that proves the authorship of the Gospel. Irenæus, indeed, does say that John wrote the Gospel when he was staying at Ephesus, in Asia ; but he does not say that he heard this from Polycarp, while for the explanation of the Revelation of John he refers to those who had seen John himself. Now it is urged, indeed, that had not Irenæus, through Polycarp, known of a Gospel composed by the Apostle John, and had not a work under this title come under his notice, he would not have recognised this as written by John ; that he recognised our fourth

* Homil. iii. 53.

† Chron. Paschal. Al. p. 14, ed Dindorf.

‡ Ad. Autolye. xi. 22.

Gospel as a work of the Apostle John, proves that Polycarp must already have spoken to him of it in this sense.

But let us consider the circumstances more accurately, as Irenæus himself represents them. As a very young man* he had seen Polycarp in Asia; and in his old age accurately remembered his figure, his mode of life, the place where he sat when he talked, his lectures to the people, all that he had to tell of his companionship with John and the rest who had seen the Lord, of their speeches and traditions about the Lord. Now, Irenæus removed afterwards, as is well known, out of the East into the West; and as Polycarp was living in Smyrna up to the year 169 A.D., and Irenæus informs us that he saw him while he was himself still quite a young man, and not afterwards, he must have so removed at a very early period. Thus, even though the Gospel of John may have reached him during the last years of the life of Polycarp, it must be very doubtful whether he would have had time to send from Lyons to Smyrna and question that apostolical personage about it, or opportunity of doing so; but if the Gospel reached him after Polycarp's death, the circumstance that among the speeches of Polycarp which he had heard in early youth, he remembered no expression alluding to a Gospel of John, need not, as a matter of course, prevent him from recognising such a Gospel as apostolic if, in other respects, it fell in with his preconceived opinions.

We do not, therefore, consider Irenæus' recognition of the Gospel of John as obligatory upon us, and that for this reason, that he does not appeal in support of such recognition to the testimony of those who had known John; and in particular, to that of Polycarp. But supposing he did so appeal, should we then consider ourselves as bound by this appeal? Or do we

* *παῖς ὢν ἔτι*, in the letter to Floris quoted in Eusebius, Church History, v. 20, 5; *ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ*; adv. hæ. iii. 3, 4; and in Eusebius, iv. 14, 3.

consider ourselves bound to recognise everything as real apostolical tradition in support of which Irenæus appeals to the testimony of those who knew the Apostles? "The men of old,"* he says in one passage, "who saw John the disciple of the Lord, remember to have heard from him how in those times the Lord taught, and said, Days will come when vines shall grow each with 10,000 shoots, and to every shoot 10,000 branches, and to every branch 10,000 tendrils, and to every tendril 10,000 bunches, and to every bunch 10,000 berries, and every berry shall yield when pressed twenty-five measures (about six puncheons) of wine. And if one of the saints shall grasp at such a bunch, another will cry, I am a better bunch, take me, and through me praise the Lord. In like manner shall a grain of wheat produce 10,000 ears, and every ear 10,000 grains, and every grain ten pounds of pure white meal; and the other fruits, seeds, and vegetables in like manner. To this Papias also, who heard John, and had intercourse with Polycarp—Papias, an ancient teacher of the Church—bears written testimony in the fourth of his books, of which he wrote five" (under the title of "Exposition of the Speeches of the Lord"). Now, supposing we had, in favour of the claims of John to the authorship of the fourth Gospel, testimony of Irenæus referring as definitely as this does to personal friends of the Apostle, it would be called the most malignant scepticism to refuse credit to this testimony; but nevertheless, to this evidence, decisive as it is, in favour of the speech of Jesus about the giant grapes of Paradise, no human being gives credit, not even Eusebius, but on account of this and similar stories calls Papias a man of very weak understanding.† And we refuse to believe this narrative because we know that the Jews would not have brought Jesus to the Cross if his doctrine had consisted in babbling to them of Rabbinic fables like this, as gross as

* Adv. hæc. v. 33, 3.

† Church History, iii. 39, 13.

anything they could have desired; because we could not ascribe to John, even as the author of the Apocalypse (to say nothing of the Gospel), anything so utterly absurd; consequently on historical grounds. To Eusebius, on the other hand, this story was incredible for the same dogmatic reason for which Irenæus thought it credible, because the doctrine of a thousand years' reign of Christ on earth, to which it belonged, was as unacceptable to the one as it was acceptable to the other. We see, therefore, how, with these ancient teachers of the Church, dogmatic grounds decided everything: if a narrative or scripture was, in its tone and substance, agreeable to their views, they looked upon defective external evidence as complete; if it was not agreeable, the most sufficient was explained away as a misunderstanding. The Gospel of John, which did not appear until very late, met with a rapid and general reception; and the reason was simply this, that it was dogmatically acceptable to all parties, offering as it did something that satisfied each without expressing that something so strongly, that while it attracted one party it must necessarily have offended the other.

Nevertheless, the Gospel did not escape without opposition. It appears, indeed, to have been the impulse given by the expressions of Jesus about the Paraclete in the fourth Gospel, no less than by the visions in the Apocalypse, to the Montanist system of prophecy, which towards the end of the second century prejudiced against the writings of John a party in the Church of Asia Minor, to which the wit of the heretic-maker, Epiphanius,* gave, on account of their rejection of the Logos-Gospel, the nickname of Alogi (unreasonable); and thus their opposition, as resting solely on dogmatic grounds, is usually without scruple set aside. But they also brought forward perfectly valid grounds of a critico-historical character. They said that the Gospel passing under the name

* Hæres. ii. 4, 18, 32; comp. Iren. adv. hæc. iii. 2, 9.

of John was false in so far as it did not agree with the other Gospels. For that, after having said that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and a little more, it goes on to say that there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee, without (as we must suppose they meant to add) making mention, as Matthew and Luke do, of the events in the childhood of Jesus. Neither did it escape their observation that the connected narrative in John of the baptism of Jesus and his journey to Galilee, which follows immediately upon it, leaves no room for the forty days of the temptation which the three first Evangelists introduce; nor, lastly, that according to the Gospel, Jesus, during his ministry, celebrated two paschal festivals, according to the others only one. The friends of the Gospel endeavoured to explain the last difference as supplying an omission. John, they said,* who had hitherto satisfied himself with oral tradition, when he saw the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, did indeed recognise the truth of their narrative, but he also noticed that they only give the last year of Jesus from the imprisonment of the Baptist; so that he, in his work, passed over this year and went back to an earlier time. But we shall find in the sequel that the contradiction cannot be reconciled by this explanation, which does not even rightly apprehend the real circumstances of the case.

The so-called Alogi, however, had deprived themselves of their strongest ground against the Gospel of John by rejecting, for dogmatic reasons, the Revelation of John, together with the Gospel. In spirit and in form the two works are so contrasted with each other, that even a disciple of Origen exposed the radical difference between them† which modern criticism has announced as one of its most certain results, that if the Apostle John is the author of the Gospel, it is

* Hieron. De vir. ill. ix.; comp. Euseb. Church History, iii. 24, 7 ff.

† Dionysius of Alexandria, in Eusebius, Church History, vii. 25.

impossible that he can have written the Apocalypse ; or that if he wrote the latter, he cannot be the author of the Gospel.* To suppose the two writings to be the works of the same composer, is much the same as to attribute the "Messiah" to Lessing, or "Nathan" to Klopstock. First, as regards the religious point of view, each of the two works stands on an opposite pole of those which we distinguish in the writers of the New Testament ; the Revelation being the most Jewish writing in it, the Gospel the least so. With Matthew, indeed, as well as with the author of the Apocalypse, Jerusalem is the holy city (Matt. iv. 5, xxvii. 53 ; Revel. xi. 2) ; but while Matthew destroys the city, together with the Temple, and represents the heathen as being called in place of the stiff-necked Jews, the Temple, according to the Revelation, is to be spared, of the city only the tenth part destroyed, while the inhabitants shall be for the most part converted. And if the author of the Revelation is more Jewishly disposed than Matthew, the composer of the Gospel shews himself to have outgrown Judaism more than even Paul. The unconditional admission of the heathen into the kingdom of God, for which the latter is still struggling, is, with the former, a finished work. The sympathy which the Apostle of the heathen ever continued to feel for the people to which by birth he belonged, has passed, in the fourth Gospel, into the most complete estrangement.† Thus it is impossible to imagine a more decided opposition than when, on the one side, the Revelationist sees in Jerusalem the central point of the millennial kingdom of Christ, whilst in the Gospel, on the other, the importance of Jerusalem as well as of Gerizim is declared to be destroyed in comparison with the worship of God in spirit and in truth ; in the one case, the anti-chris-

* De Wette, Introduction to New Testament, § 189, sixth ed.

† Comp. on this point Fisher's satisfactory treatise on the expression *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι* in the Gospel of John : Tübingen Theol. Zeitschr. 1840, No. 2.

tian principle is represented by heathendom ; in the other, Judaism is the peculiar kingdom of unbelief.

With this difference in the point of view, the difference also in tone and spirit of the two writings is connected. When men called John the Apostle of love, they were thinking only of the Gospel and the first Epistle; for, looking to the Revelation, they must rather have called him the Apostle of wrath and vengeance. In the Gospel, indeed, there also reigns a spirit of severity which insists upon the separation of the ungodly element; but the Evangelist prefers, nevertheless, to dwell throughout upon the redeeming, the concentrating, the uniting operation of Christ and his Spirit; while the Revelationist, on the contrary, revels in depicting the execution of divine vengeance on a godless world. It is also a Jewish feature in the Revelation that in it the course of the narrative represents a series of external catastrophes produced from above, while the Gospel has already elevated itself, though not as yet completely so, to the idea of a gradual development of the kingdom of God from within. The visionary character, the complex machinery of angels, and the scheme of the Revelation, which, fantastical as it is, is nevertheless Rabbinical—all this, as contrasted with the simplicity and the mystical tone of feeling in the Gospel, might be attributed to the difference in style in which the author chose to write on the one occasion and on the other; but it is scarcely possible that the same author who, in the style of the Apocalypse, moved in an element most appropriate to his own nature, should likewise have been able to move in that of the Gospel, so opposite to it, as if no other could suit him. Lastly, one who at the end of middle age (for at the time previous to which the Revelation could not have been written, the Apostle must have been close upon sixty years old) still wrote the awkward and faulty Jewish Greek of the Revelation, could not, as an old man, have adopted the flowing Greek style of the Gospel, a style which, though not pure, is nevertheless pleasing of its kind.

Two works so radically different could not have been produced by the same composer. This major proposition, the modern criticism of the New Testament specially represented by Schleiermacher and his disciples, maintained as unquestionably true, so long as they were not aware that it could occur to any one to object to their minor, "so John is the "author of the Gospel." It did actually occur to the Tübingen school to do so; they even put the Apocalypse into the minor, instead of the Gospel, as the work of the Apostle, and then drew the conclusion that the Gospel could not be a work of the Apostle. Since this dangerous turn in the argument, theologians have again become doubtful about the major, and now it is either supposed that there is only one step from the Apocalypse to the Gospel, as possible for the same individual,* or the youthful fire which was damped in the Gospel is supposed, on occasion given, to have again broken out in the Apocalypse.† Now the latter, the composition of the Apocalypse after the Gospel, may be described as something psychologically inconceivable; while in the former case a possibility is assumed which has not the smallest probability in its favour. But if the alternative is to be admitted, then the turn which the Tübingen school has given it, has far the strongest grounds in its favour, that if one of the two writings is to have the Apostle for its author, this may be assumed of the Revelation with much more probability than of the Gospel.

It is well known that of all the canonical books of the New Testament, the Revelation of John is the one the date of which we can determine most accurately from internal evidence. Speaking of the seven kings represented in the seven heads of the Beast, it says that the five first have fallen, that the sixth is now in existence, that the seventh

* Hase, *The Tübingen School*, Letters to Baur, p. 30.

† Luthardt, *Peculiarity of the Gospel of John*.

will come, but not live long, and that then one of the seven will return as the eighth (xvii. 9—11). Now the five fallen heads are evidently the Roman Emperors, from Augustus until Nero; Nero, at that time already dead, is the head wounded to the death, but whose wound is again healed (xiii. 3), inasmuch as the reality of his death was doubted, or, on the part of the Christians, his miraculous resurrection was expected, and now they looked for his return, as the Antichrist, from the East, whither he was supposed to have retired.* Consequently, the sixth Emperor, existing at the time of the composition of the book, can be none other than Galba, who reigned only from June, 68 A.D., until January, 69. The Apostle John might very easily have been still living at this date; but in the Gospel there is evidence of all kinds pointing to a time when it was scarcely possible that any disciple of Jesus should have been in existence—none, certainly, in a position to compose a work like the fourth Gospel.

Moreover, there is a correspondence between the peculiar character which distinguishes the Apostle John, not only in the other books of the New Testament, but in almost every part of the most ancient tradition of the Church, which is not found in the Gospel. John and his brother, or their mother, on behalf of both, aspired to the foremost places in the kingdom of the Messiah (Matt. xx. 20 ff.). This might be considered as a Jewish point of view, and John, in consequence of the death of Jesus, might have raised himself above it. But when we read of the offer made by the brothers to cause fire from heaven to fall upon a city of Samaria which would not receive Jesus (Luke ix. 54), then, on the one hand, the epithet of Boanerges, or sons of thunder, given

* With regard to the opinion of the Roman people on this point, see Tacit. Hist. i. 2, ii. 8; Sueton. Nero, 57; comp. Baur, the two Epistles to the Thessalonians; Theolog. Jahrb. 1855, p. 141 ff.

to the brothers (Mark iii. 17), appears to point to the fact that such fiery zeal was the constant characteristic of the temperament of both; while, on the other, we recognise in such a tone of mind exactly the Apocalypticist with his vials of wrath and his sea of sulphur. And as regards John in particular, he shews, in his attack upon a man who drove out devils in the name of Jesus without attaching himself to the company of his disciples (Mark ix. 38 ff.; Luke ix. 49 ff.), a very exclusive character; and if there is truth in the story resting upon the tradition of Polycarp, and told by Eusebius, of his fanatical conduct towards the heretic Cerinthus,* there appears to have been no diminution of this illiberal jealousy in his extreme old age. In the Epistle to the Galatians (ii. 9), we find John, with Peter, and James the brother of the Lord, as one of the three whom Paul calls, not without a touch of irony, "seeming pillars;" one of the men who, in opposition to the Apostle of the heathen, represented the Judaizing tendency, and were only compelled by the firmness of Paul and the force of circumstances to allow him, half against their will, to be a witness to the truth. It is, indeed, quite in character for such a man to do as the author of the Apocalypse does in the messages to the Churches of Asia Minor which preface his work (ii. 7—14), that is, under the name of the Nicolaitanes, and the doctrine of Balaam, to combat and describe as their degeneracy a tendency which was that of Paul; and by those "who call themselves Apostles, "but are not" (Rev. ii. 2), Paul with his disciples, who had founded those Churches, is probably meant; but between the Judaizing *pillar Apostle* of the Epistle to the Galatians, and the Evangelists, with whom the heathen world is the proper ground for the spreading of Christianity, a gulf is placed

* Church History, iii. 28, 6. On the other hand, the narrative from the so-called Testament of John in Hieron. in ep. ad Gal. 6, which gave occasion to one of Lessing's most beautiful minor works, is taken from a survey of the Gospel and the first Epistle.

which could be crossed only by means of struggles, of the development of which in the Gospel we do not discover the most remote trace.

The difficulty of supposing the Apostle John to have been the author of the fourth Gospel is also increased by an old tradition of Asia Minor.* In the dispute which, in the last half of the second century, broke out between the Christian Churches in Asia on the one hand, and the Romish on the other, which in this had on its side most of the other Eastern Churches as well, with regard to the day of celebrating the festival of Easter, the Asiatics appealed to the example of the Apostle John, for an observance to which the so-called Gospel of John is directly opposed. It was on the same day on which the Jews ate the paschal lamb, or what took the place of it after the destruction of the Temple, that is on the evening of the 14th of the month Nisan, that the Asiatic Christians were accustomed to celebrate the Last Supper, instituted by Christ, according to the synoptic narrative, on this evening. On the other hand, the heads of the Romish Church maintained that Christians were not to bind themselves to this day, which might fall on any day of the week, but to postpone the celebration of the Easter Supper to the following Sunday, as the day of the resurrection. The point in dispute was first discussed about the year 160 A.D., when Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, came to Rome, by himself and the Romish Bishop Anicetus, and in so doing Polycarp appealed in support of the Asiatic custom of celebrating the Easter Supper on the day of the Jewish Passover, the 14th of Nisan, to the fact "that he, with John the disciple of the Lord, and the other Apostles with whom he lived, always kept it on this day."† Now, according to the fourth Gospel, Jesus did

* For what follows, comp. Baur, *Canonical Gospels*, p. 334 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Gospels*, p. 342 ff.; and a series of treatises by both in Zeller's *Theolog. Jahrbücher* and Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift*.

† From the Epistle of Polycrates to Victor, in Eusebius, v. 24, 16.

not eat the Passover at all before his death, but prepared the Last Supper with his disciples the evening before, on the 13th, where there is nothing said of the institution of the Supper: the author, therefore, of this Gospel had no ground for attaching the Easter Eucharist to a day on which, according to him, Jesus ate no meal at all, but suffered and died. The usage of the Apostle John, attested by Polycarp, points rather to the proceedings as given by the three first Evangelists; whereas, on the contrary, the account of the fourth Gospel appears to have arisen from the effort not only to separate generally Christianity from Judaism, but also the Easter of the former from the Jewish Passover, by representing that Jesus did not eat the latter, but, as the true Paschal Lamb, who puts an end to the merely symbolical lamb of the Jews, was slain on the day appointed for the sacrifice of it. Nothing is said of the Romish Bishop having appealed to the fourth Gospel in the discussion with Polycarp; on the other hand, ten or fifteen years later, when the dispute was renewed in Laodicea, we find a trace of its existence, so that it is probable that it was produced in the interval, and not without reference to the very question. For when Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis, says of those who held by the 14th of Nisan (the so-called Quartodecimans), that they maintain that Matthew represents the matter in this sense, but that it would follow from this that the Gospels would contradict each other,* this cannot be understood otherwise than that Apollinaris started from the account of the fourth Gospel, which places the last meal of Jesus on the evening of the 13th, and

* In the passage of the Paschal Chronicle above quoted—*καὶ στασιάζειν δοκεῖ κατ' αὐτοὺς τὰ εὐαγγέλια* I consider as a failure every attempt to explain, with Schwegler and Baur, *στασιάζειν*, otherwise than by *inter se pugnare*. Apollinaris disputed as if he thought to prove the unanimity of the four Gospels by forcing the three first to agree with the fourth, without remembering that his opponents, who brought about the same unanimity by forcing John into agreement with the Synoptics, could, from their point of view, retort upon him the same objection when he explained John differently from what they did.

his death on the 14th, and then (like many theologians at the present day) did not hesitate to explain the account of Matthew according to that of John.

Thus, in every instance in which we start from what we know of the Apostle John, we are thrown upon a tendency irreconcilable with what we find in the fourth Gospel; and, conversely, starting from the fourth Gospel, we come upon a point which we do not find in the Apostle John. As a man born in Palestine during the existence of the Jewish constitution, and who lived there until, at all events, the age of manhood, the Apostle must have been acquainted with the country and its institutions. But this is not the case with the Evangelist. To prove this, one instance will suffice. Setting aside all other points about which a doubt may exist, as, for instance, the mention of a Bethany on the Jordan, i. 28, of which no trace is found elsewhere, the fabulous description of the pool of Bethesda, v. 2 ff.; the false explanation of the name of Siloa, ix. 7; the brook of Cedars, instead of the brook Kidron, xviii. 1, the only other place in which this is met with being the Greek translation of 2 Sam. xv. 23, consequently of Alexandrian origin, and the like; let us consider simply the term "High-priest for that year," xi. 51, xviii. 13. In spite of all explanations and evasions, the unprejudiced mind will never find anything in this expression but the notion of the Evangelist that the holder of the office of High-priest was annually changed, and, on this occasion, from Annas to Caiaphas; whereas an Apostle, a native of Palestine, must have known better, and, in particular, have remembered that Caiaphas had been in office a number of years. The exact knowledge of the Old Testament which is certainly shewn by the Evangelist, does not necessarily point to a native of Palestine, and not even to a Jewish Christian at all, since, with the Jewish origin of the Christian Churches, and the importance of the Old Testament as the foundation of the new faith, even one who was not a Jew might, as we see

by the example of Justin Martyr, feel himself inclined and be in a condition to gain such knowledge. While, on the other hand, the Apostle can scarcely be credited with the knowledge of Alexandrine, and especially Philonic, speculation which the Evangelist displays. Independent of the fact that, according to the three first Gospels, he was a man of low rank, a Galilean fisherman (it is only in the fourth, the authenticity of which is now in question, that he appears as an acquaintance of the High-priest), he seems, as far as we know of him from the letters of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles, to have been innocent of such knowledge, and cannot therefore have acquired it until a later period, probably after his removal into Asia Minor. But he wrote the Apocalypse in Asia Minor in the year 68, and this not only exhibits a spirit entirely foreign to that of the Gospel, but is without a trace of Alexandrine philosophy. But that at a period later than this, in extreme old age, he should have been still inclined and able to identify himself with a novel mode of thought, and one so far removed from the range of his ideas hitherto, and at the same time to mould it in so peculiar and consistent a form as that in which we have it in the Gospel, is a supposition devoid of the slightest semblance of probability.

Thus the review of the evidence with regard to the three first Gospels gives this result, that soon after the beginning of the second century certain traces are found of their existence, not indeed in their present form, but still of the presence of a considerable portion of their contents, and with every indication that the main portion of these contents is derived from the country which was the theatre of the events in question. On the other hand, the issue of the examination with regard to the fourth Gospel is far less favourable, and goes to prove that it was not known until after the middle of the century, and bears every indication of having arisen upon a foreign soil, and under the influence of a philosophy of the time unknown

to the original circle in which Jesus lived. In the first case, it is true that the period between the occurrence of the events and the recording of them in their present form, amounts to several generations, and the possibility is not excluded that what is legendary and unhistorical may have crept in; but in the latter, there is every probability of an admixture of philosophical combination and conscious fiction.

B.—THE GOSPELS VIEWED ACCORDING TO THEIR INTERNAL CHARACTERISTICS AND THEIR RELATION TO EACH OTHER.

14. DIFFERENT HYPOTHESES AS TO THE RELATION OF THE THREE FIRST GOSPELS—LESSING, EICHHORN, HUG, GRIESBACH, GIESELER, SCHLEIERMACHER.

Now if we turn from the external evidence for our four Gospels and examine their internal character, in so far as this character has not already come under discussion in passing, and their relation to each other,* we shall find that in this point of view also the three first group themselves together in contrast to the fourth. The latter takes its own course, and coincides with the others only in a few main points of the evangelical history, but in speeches and expressions scarcely ever. The former, with several variations not only in the arrangement and selection of matter, but also in expression, still on the whole run so parallel that they admit of a combined tabulated survey (synopsis, hence synoptic Gospels).

* As to what follows, comp. Baur, *Critical Examination of the Canonical Gospels*, Introduction, p. 1 ff. Introduction to the New Testament as Theological Science, *Theological Annual*, 1850, p. 463 ff.; 1851, p. 70 ff., 222 ff., 291 ff. Hilgenfeld, *Examination of the Course of Events in the Gospels*; *Journal of Scientific Theology*, 1861, pp. 1—71, 137—204. The Canon and Criticism of the New Testament, p. 125 ff.

Now, the relation of the three first Evangelists to one another is peculiar and unexampled in the whole range of literature of the same kind. It was this which first invited a deeper investigation, which, however, could find no satisfactory result until their relation to the fourth had been examined. In the case of the three first, the question was how three writers could so entirely agree, often even in the words they used, and how, again, they could differ so importantly from one another. As long as the divine inspiration of the Biblical writings was assumed, the agreement was easily explained. The real author of the collective Gospels was, of course, the Holy Spirit, the Evangelists only his amanuenses, and the only thing surprising was that the accounts did not coincide throughout, or that the Holy Spirit did not dictate to the pen of one exactly the same thing as to that of another. This circumstance was attempted to be explained on the supposition that the Spirit accommodated himself partly to the peculiar character of the Evangelists, partly to the wants of the readers for whom the separate Gospels were intended, and this accommodation might suffice to make it intelligible why one omits what another communicates, or why in narrating the same circumstances one expresses himself at greater length than another. When, on the other hand, the same event is told with different details, or fixed by one Evangelist at an earlier, by another at a later period of the life of Jesus,—when a speech of Jesus is found sometimes differently understood, sometimes differently placed,—in these cases only one statement can be the correct one, and it is not to be imagined of the Holy Spirit that he can have inspired any of the writers whom he so inspired with what was incorrect. So that two writers differing in this way could only be right on the assumption that each was describing a different event; so that, for instance, Jesus was twice rejected by the men of Nazareth, once at the first beginning of his ministry and again at a later period; the buyers and

sellers were twice driven out of the Temple by him, once on the occasion of his first visit to Jerusalem and again on the occasion of his last, and each Evangelist who describes only one of these events omits the other. But as it was necessary, in order to acquit the Holy Spirit of any untruth or even inaccuracy, to understand everything literally, and on account of ever so slight a variation in trifling details to refer two narratives, which would otherwise have been taken as identical, to two different events, the consequence of the repeated occurrence of exactly the same event with only slightly different details gave the evangelical history a character which made it unlike any other. But when people could no longer prevail upon themselves to agree with a Storr, and to suppose two captains in Capernaum at different times to have had two sick servants, and one as well as the other to have been healed by Jesus at a distance with a word; two little daughters of rulers of the Synagogue to have died and been awakened by Jesus; and twice on the same occasion on the road to the house a woman with a bloody flux to have been made whole by touching him,—then error and inaccuracy, though only in details, were allowed as possible for the Evangelists, and they were virtually placed upon the same footing as other human writers.

In order to make the relation of the Gospels to one another intelligible from this point of view, to explain their coincidences and their differences, what they have in common as well as what each has peculiar to itself, Lessing wrote his "New Hypothesis about the Evangelists considered as merely Human Writers" (1788); a mere pamphlet, in two sheets, but containing the fruitful seeds of all subsequent inquiries upon this subject. In this pamphlet Lessing considers the basis of all the Gospels to have been a written collection of records about the life and doctrine of Jesus which grew out of the oral narratives of the Apostles and other eye-witnesses. These he supposes to have arisen among the old Jewish

Christians in Palestine, the so-called Nazarenes, then to have been altered, enlarged or compressed by more than one possessor or copyist of them, and at last freely translated into Greek out of the native language of Palestine, in order to be available for a larger circle. After the original authorities which this writing followed, it might be called the Gospel of the Apostles; according to the circle of readers for whom it was intended, the Gospel of the Nazarenes or of the Hebrews; and there is no doubt that these names do constantly recur to designate the same Gospel in the most ancient Fathers of the Church. After the Greek translation it was called the Gospel of Matthew, for it was he, according to Lessing, who wrote, not, as Papias erroneously says, a Hebrew Gospel which every one translated into Greek as well as he could, but who put into a Greek dress the Gospel of the Nazarenes originally written in Hebrew. As such, the Gospel of the Nazarenes might appear to many persons not to be sufficiently explicit, and thus arose several new paraphrases of the Hebrew original; among others, our Gospel of Luke, the author of which made a different selection and arrangement from Matthew, and took pains to write better Greek; while Mark, in his work, appears to have had before him a less perfect copy of the Hebrew record. John also, according to Lessing, knew and made use of, not only the original, but also the Gospels extracted out of it, especially our three first, although his Gospel is not to be considered as belonging to them, but forms a class by itself. The earlier Gospels, and the idea of Christ spread abroad by them, did not satisfy him. So he endeavoured, not to supply their deficiencies in point of matter, for his Gospel gives an impression altogether different from a collection of supplements, but to take a higher view of the power of Christ, representing him not merely, as the other Gospels do, as the greatest of prophets, or as the Son of God in the sense of the Jewish conception of the Messiah, but in a metaphysical sense, as a Mediator

between God and man. And such a representation alone could prevent Christianity from disappearing as time went on, like every other mere Jewish sect; it was only the Gospel of John that gave consistency and duration to the Christian religion. Thus Matthew and John stand in contrast to each other as the Gospels of the flesh and the spirit. Again, on the side of the first there are two more Gospels, and thus the Gospel of the flesh is triply represented, or rather out of the far more numerous Gospels of this class, only Mark and Luke, besides Matthew, have been recognised by the Church. And this, according to Lessing, is accounted for by the fact that these two do, in many points, fill up as it were the gap which lies between Matthew and John; and because the one was the disciple of Peter, the other of Paul. This also is the cause of the order in which the Gospels stand in our canon, for it cannot be proved that this is the order of time in which they were written.

Lessing paid greater attention to the origin and connection of the three first Gospels than to the peculiarity of the fourth. Eichhorn* brought the question as to the mode of explaining the relation of these three to one another for a considerable time into the foreground of critical discussions. There were, as has already been mentioned, two things to be explained, their coincidence and their difference. A coincidence on the part of the three writers in words and facts, in the juxtaposition of separate thoughts and entire sequence of events, such as we find in our three first Gospels, is, according to Eichhorn, only to be explained by the use of written records. And one of two cases would be possible; either one Evangelist might have made use of the other, or all might have used a common source. Eichhorn considers that the first supposition should not be adopted, because, though it

* Eichhorn first stated his view in 1794 in the fifth volume of his *General Cyclopædia*; then in 1804, in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, explained it more fully with reference to the objections made to it in the interval.

would account for the agreement, it would not explain the numerous discrepancies. Supposing Mark to have had Matthew before him, Luke Mark, or both Matthew and Mark, why should the succeeding writer have left out so much which his predecessor told; why arranged and represented so much in a different manner; why have so often altered the expression without apparent reason? On the other hand, on the assumption of a common written source, from which all three Evangelists drew, the two sides of their reciprocal relation appear to admit of satisfactory explanation. They used the same original Gospel, hence their agreement; but they used it not immediately, but one of them in one, another in a different paraphrase, hence their difference from one another. Eichhorn thought he had found the original Gospel when he had struck out all in which the three Gospels differed from one another, and left what they had in common. And this original Gospel appeared to him to be only a rough sketch, a short clue for the first heralds of the faith, composed in the Aramaic language, and subsequently extended by different hands, and paraphrased in Greek. Now of such paraphrases, if one Evangelist used one, another another, we see why one should have much that another wants, or has it in a different place. It was because the matter of the one was wanting, or was differently arranged, in the paraphrase of the original Gospel which he used, from that which was used by the other. In the same way, on the supposition of the use of different Greek translations, may be explained the variation in the Greek expression in the case of narratives which are in other respects identical. On the other hand, in those cases in which two, or even all three, Evangelists agree in the use of perfectly accidental Greek words, a resource lay in the supposition that a Greek translation of the original Gospel, in its unexpanded form, had been in existence, and occasionally taken into council by the translators of the different paraphrases of it.

We see at once how in the case of every new example, of

every point of view that was taken up from time to time from which to observe the manifold relation of these Gospels to one another, a fresh assumption was necessary; the whole thing became continually more and more complex and artificial, and at the same time the contradiction more glaring between these assumptions and theories on the one hand, and the simple circumstances of the period and the circle in which the Gospels arose. Hence Schleiermacher's declaration, that in order to make the hypothesis of an original Gospel inadmissible, it was enough for him to know that he must imagine our simple Evangelists surrounded by four, five, six open manuscripts and books, in different languages moreover, looking first into one and then into another, and compiling out of all; a process, he said, which transported him rather into a German book-manufactory of the nineteenth century, than into that birth-time of Christianity. Even Herder was repelled from Eichhorn's explanation by the prosaic notion of an apostolical chancery-office, to which it seemed to lead, and so far sided more with the notions indicated by Lessing. What he added to them was, indeed, too hastily written, and too ambiguous to be a permanent gain; still the importance he attached to the idea of the oral evangelical preaching as the source of the written Gospels was not without subsequent effect, nor was he without followers in his arrangement of Mark and Luke before Matthew.

The theory of the original Gospel had in particular two weaker sides on which it was open to attack, and has actually been attacked, first on one and then on the other. One was that of the alternatives, either one of the three first Evangelists must have made use of the other two, or all together of a common source. Eichhorn, without hesitation, rejected the first. Why, asked Hug,* is it to be so inconceivable that one Evangelist should have used the work of another?

* Introduction to the Scriptures of the New Covenant (1808).

Is it on account of the many and important differences in the narratives? But does not Livy, in many ways, differ from Polybius, of whom, nevertheless, he made use, according to his own admission? Is an author who has before him the work of another obliged to copy it off word for word? If in consequence of more extensive investigation, of using more numerous sources of information, or of a different point of view, as things appear to him otherwise than it did to his predecessor, is he not to venture to differ from his predecessor's account of it, even though he has this account before him? There is, therefore, no objection to the assumption that one Evangelist used the work of another; and all that is important is to investigate the peculiar plan, the particular object of each of these writings, in order to discover the reasons of the mode of representation of the one differing from that of the other. According to Hug, indeed, in the relation of the Evangelists to each other, everything tends only to an improvement and completion of one by another, ending in a fourfold guarantee of truth. Mark, having been put into a condition to do so by communications from the Apostle Peter, amended the work of Matthew in point of order and arrangement of time, adding several more accurate touches; Luke, as a man of knowledge and education, subjected his two predecessors to a fresh testing and correction; John, lastly, who was acquainted with all the three who had worked before him, gave to their accounts the final completion and perfection. But every correction of a predecessor supposes in him an incorrectness; and even the effect of the completion of the work of the one by the other can only be to place the author whose work is to be completed in a very disadvantageous light. If the author of the fourth Gospel is correct in saying, that before his last journey to Jerusalem, Jesus had already often sojourned there, had taught and worked there, then the author of the first, who knows nothing of all these earlier journeys and sojournings, cannot have been a companion of

Jesus, not the Apostle Matthew. Neither, again, can the second Gospel have been written in accordance with the communications of the Apostle Peter, for he could not have failed to draw the attention of his author especially to that radical defect in the first Gospel, and to have urged him to the correction of it. And when John, the last corrector, omits conversely so much which he finds in his predecessor, how do we know that this is agreement? In itself it might be just as easily rejection, and only takes the appearance of agreement from a point of view which in this relation generally supposes nothing but unanimity.

This apologetic point of view, this acquiescence in ecclesiastical tradition, betrays itself in the case of Hug, by the fact that, in reference to the question in which order of time the several Evangelists used and corrected one another, he does not hesitate to stand by the order in which they are placed in the canon, though Lessing had already ingeniously pointed out that this order might be caused by something entirely different from their succession to each other in point of time. In reference to this question, a theory had already been propounded before that of Hug, and attacked by him on insufficient grounds, though it corresponded to the actual state of the case better than his own. Between two Gospels, which with many coincidences exhibit also many marks of independence of each other, each having whole sections peculiar to itself, and even the matter common to both to a certain extent in different order, there stands a Gospel which, in point of matter, has scarcely anything exclusively its own, and of its sixteen chapters, only about as much as would fill half a chapter not common to the one or the other of its adjacent Gospels, coinciding likewise in point of arrangement sometimes with one of these, sometimes with the other, and seeming sometimes to compile the form of expression from both the others together. The supposition then spontaneously forces itself upon us, that a Gospel like this does not,

in point of time, stand between the two others, but was afterwards made up from them as its already existing sources. This view has been brought forward by Griesbach,* and by the clear explanation which seemed to result from it was held to be so convincing, that up to the latest period it was able to hold its ground as the really popular one among theologians.

The authors of the three first Gospels—this had been the alternative from which the different theories hitherto explained set out—must either have used one the writing of another, or one as well as another, a common source: that this source was a written one was the ordinary supposition. At last it became the turn of this supposition also to be called in question. It was assumed as certain that the original evangelical preaching had, at all events, been oral, and that the information also about the life of Christ had been spread abroad for a considerable time orally was, it was said, in part probable in itself, the cultivation and circumstances of the Apostles being taken into account, in part capable of proof, in so far as that in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul no trace appears of the existence of a written Gospel in his time. On the other hand, there was every probability that this oral tradition—that is, the mode in which the so-called Evangelists brought out the most important particulars in the biography of Jesus—soon assumed a fixed type in point of selection, arrangement, and even in expression. This is the original Gospel in an oral form, which Gieseler† opposed to the written one of Eichhorn, and from which he thought he could explain the imperfect agreement of our three first Gospels not worse than Eichhorn, and their differences better than those who supposed one Evangelist to have been used by another. Gieseler imagined a resemblance

* *Comment. qua Marci Evang. totum e Matt. et Lucæ Commentariis decerptum esse monstratur* (1789 and 1790), *Opusc. ii. p. 385 ff.* Comp. Saunier on the Sources of the Gospel of Mark (1825).

† Upon the Origin and Fortunes of the written Gospels in the earliest Times.

between the three first preachers of the Gospel on the one hand, and the Greek rhapsodists, in whose mouths the Homeric lays continued to survive, but underwent at the same time numerous modifications and expansions. Such an analogy recommended this theory to a generation which laboured to penetrate more deeply into the spirit of antiquity, to apprehend more vividly the origin of poetry and religion. In the midst of the mere oral tradition, the evangelical history appeared as a living thing, having the power of growth, of separating into branches, putting out fresh twigs and shoots, and thus the prospect was opened to a much more liberal interpretation of the historical substance of the Gospels.

With all this, however, the next problem, the explanation of the mutual relation to one another of the Gospels in question, could by no means be considered as solved. Their manifold differences might indeed be fairly enough explained upon this supposition of a simply oral source, common to them all, and even much greater ones would not have surprised us; but so much the less did it enable us to account for their manifold agreement. How happened it that they follow not merely in general the same selection and arrangement of their matter, but also that more than once a case occurs in which two events, which manifestly did not succeed each other in point of time, but are accidentally placed one after another by one Evangelist, appear in the other two also in the same connection? And whence would come the absolute agreement in expression, extending, in some cases, to the use of most extraordinary Greek words?

To the Homeric rhapsodists who had to pronounce a rhythmical poem, the form and the expression were of importance; not so, surely, to the preachers of the Gospel; or, if at all, only when they reproduced the speeches of Jesus; for the rest, the substance of their narratives was the principal thing; that the form of words in which they delivered these was

stereotyped cannot be supposed, as we can see no reason for its having been so. But what do we want more, when our third Evangelist says himself, in his own preface, that in his own time there were already several evangelical writings, and his Gospel bears manifest traces of his having used these written copies as his sources of information, and by no means merely the oral tradition?

It is not, indeed, to be assumed as a matter of course that what the author of the third Gospel had before him was our two first Gospels, or that we are everywhere to understand by the first evangelical records writings which embraced the whole life of Jesus. And here a new attempt is made to explain the relation between the three first Evangelists. When we ask, says Schleiermacher,* speaking immediately in opposition to Eichhorn, which of the two we are to consider as the more probable origin of evangelical literature, a connected, but bald, narrative, embracing the whole life of Jesus (like the original Gospel of Eichhorn), or numerous and prolix records of particular events, we can have no hesitation in deciding in favour of the latter. So that, according to Schleiermacher, we are to suppose the first occasion of the writing of Christian history to have been, not the free impulse of the busy Apostles and earliest active disciples, but the curiosity of those who had believed in Jesus without having known him personally, and now wished to learn some more accurate particulars about his life.

At the public meetings of the Christians this curiosity was satisfied but very accidentally and sparingly; when a teacher might chance to refer to memorable sayings of Christ, which necessitated an account of the historical occasion that gave rise to them, the curious hearers could only get more complete information by confidential intercourse and special

* On the Writings of Luke (1817). Comp. his Introduction to the New Testament, compiled from Lectures, Collected Works, first Div. Theology, Vol. viii. 1845.

inquiry. And thus many individual facts were told and learnt, most of them without being written down. Soon, however, much was undoubtedly written down, partly by the narrators themselves, still more by the inquirers, especially those who could not always be with their informants, and who would be glad in their turn to communicate the information to many other persons. Thus separate events have been recorded, and separate speeches, and these records arose more frequently, and were more eagerly sought for, when the main body of the original companions of Christ was scattered by persecutions, and still more when the first generation of Christians began to die off. Then the authors, as well as the possessors, of individual records set about completing them, and became collectors, each according to his personal inclination. Thus, perhaps, one collected only accounts of miracles, another only speeches; to a third, the last days of Christ were alone of importance, or the scenes of the resurrection; others, without any such decided preference, collected all they could get hold of. And then the particular portions of which collections of this sort consisted were from different sources and of different value, by no means all at first hand, many even at second or third hand; some parts even had come from turbid sources, altered by defective recollection, prejudice, and love of the marvellous. Such compilations of separate written portions of narrative, made in the generation subsequent to the Apostles, Schleiermacher considers our three first Gospels to be, not even excepting that of Mark, with respect to which he expressly repudiates the view of Griesbach, though with difficulty and not without hesitation.

Now, if we ask how it was possible that three collectors, selecting independently of each other from a store of narratives and groups of narratives, should have hit with such remarkable agreement upon, for the most part, the same portions,—Schleiermacher undertakes to explain this circum-

stance, but most unsatisfactorily, by pointing, on the one hand, to the mass of matter which a writing intended for easy multiplication of copies must have contained; on the other, to the pre-eminent importance which just those portions are supposed to have had for the purposes of evangelical preaching. For if Jesus, as our Gospel says, healed so many persons—blind, lame, and leprous—drove out so many devils, how happens it that out of this number of stories our first three Evangelists selected for more detailed narration exactly the same dozen or so, with a few, perhaps, only apparent exceptions, leaving with the same agreement the remainder lying in the obscurity of a summary notice? For among them there were certainly many (let us remember only the different selection in John) not less convincing as miracles. How, we ask, did this happen if each made his selection independently of the other? The same question may be asked in reference to the speeches of Jesus; and quite as little does the arrangement of the subject-matter in the first three Gospels, being, as it is, on the whole, the same in each, admit of explanation from Schleiermacher's point of view.

The defects attaching to each of these theories individually allowed of being removed, in part, by combining them together. The so-called tradition-hypothesis, in particular, *i.e.* the assumption of an oral tradition as a primary or supplementary source, admits of being appended to each one of the remainder. But the most important, though unobserved, result of all these attempts to explain the origin and mutual relation of the first three Evangelists was indisputably this—that the composition of them was thereby brought down to a period so late, and made so secondary an affair, that an Apostle or Apostle's assistant as the composer was out of the question. Eichhorn had already contracted within the narrowest limits the participation of Matthew in the first, of Mark and Luke in the second and third Gospels, without, however, altogether giving it up. Schleiermacher uses the titles, Gospel of Matthew,

Mark, Luke, altogether as traditional appellations, without prejudice to the question as to whether the share which these persons may have had in the composition of the Gospels called after them was greater or less, or even any at all.

15. THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. BRETSCHNEIDER, SCHLEIERMACHER.

While thus the widest range was given to critical scepticism respecting the first three Gospels, the credibility and apostolical origin of the fourth continued to be unhesitatingly assumed. At first the sceptical direction as to the others was freely taken, because this sure historical reserve could always be relied on; and at last the credibility of the first three Gospels was brought to the lowest point in order to make the contradiction between them and the fourth, becoming as it did more and more evident, unprejudicial to the latter. If the claims of the first and fourth Gospel to apostolical origin were opposed to each other, and their accounts of the person and life of Jesus were irreconcilable, it was quite as possible that the fourth, as that the first, would have to abandon those claims. On the other hand, if the former was first removed out of the way of the latter, this latter maintained unquestioned its apostolical value.

This position has been taken up by conservative theology, especially since the dangerous attack which, after skirmishes of all kinds by less scientific predecessors, Bretschneider* in his "Probabilia" delivered against the authenticity and credibility of the Gospel of John. Bretschneider's base and support was the historical credibility of the first three Gospels; and inasmuch as he found not merely separate accounts, but the general survey contained in the fourth Gospel, of the person and works of Jesus irreconcilable with that of preced-

* *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Joannis Apostoli indole et origine* (1820).

ing ones, he concluded that the fourth could not be a credible historical record, and consequently not the work of the Apostle John. Supposing, says Bretschneider, that the Gospel of John had been by accident unknown for these 1800 years, and now discovered all at once in our own time in the East, every one would certainly admit that the Jesus of this Gospel is quite a different person from the Jesus of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and that it is impossible that both these pictures of the same person can be true. Most persons now either do not observe this difference, or at all events do not clearly apprehend it. But this is the consequence rather of long habit and a deeply-rooted prejudice in favour of the truth of the fourth Gospel than of decided opinion or firm conviction.

The essential difference between the Jesus of John and of the Synoptics was found by Bretschneider especially in the speeches. The first three Gospels shew us Jesus as a genuine Teacher of the people, who combated the false tendencies which opposed among his countrymen true piety and morality, especially the Pharisaic spirit of exterior observance; insisted upon purity of mind, upon efforts to attain to a resemblance with God, and upon love towards mankind; and who taught these doctrines in a form, the clearness and simplicity of which, its warmth and comprehensiveness, could not fail to be, for men of all classes, intelligible, attractive, and exciting. Of this practical and popular Teacher, said he, a subtle metaphysician is made in the fourth Gospel; his speeches, instead of turning upon the fear of God and righteousness, turn almost exclusively upon the subjects of the higher dignity of his own Person, which he conceives, not in the rational form of the Jewish idea of the Messiah, but in the sense of the Alexandrine doctrine of the Logos, brought forward by the Evangelist in his preface; and his mode of expression is so obscure and ambiguous, his professions so cold, artificial, and full of repetitions,

his whole conduct so rough, that his intention might appear to have been, not to attract people, but to repel them from him. Of these two irreconcilable representations of Jesus, the first, says he, has internal probability and suitability to circumstances in its favour, in the same degree in which the other betrays itself to be fiction by the opposite characteristics. Together with this principal ground of doubt which he found in the speeches, Bretschneider also endeavoured to shew, from the narratives in the fourth Gospel, from the ignorant manner in which he speaks of the Jews, from the incorrectness of many accounts of localities, and notices of other kinds, that its author, so far from being an Apostle or eye-witness, could not have been even an inhabitant of Palestine, or a native Jew, but must have been a philosophically educated Christian from among the heathen. The obvious reference to later objections and doctrinal disputes appeared to him to point to the middle of the second century as the time, the connection with the Alexandrian Gnosticism, to Alexandria as the place, of its composition, the especial object of which appeared to be the defence of Christianity against Jewish attacks, and the recommendation of it to the Grecian world.

So violent an assault as this upon the genuineness and credibility of the fourth Gospel, while it attracted great attention among the majority of theologians, made but little impression upon them. And this was scarcely to be wondered at, as the attachment to ecclesiastical tradition is as wide-spread and obstinate as the sense for critical investigation is rare. Even Bretschneider himself subsequently declared that he had attained the object of his "Probabilia" and been relieved of his doubts by the discussions which they had provoked. And this is quite intelligible, inasmuch as his theological point of view generally had not the depth necessary to enable him to recognise all the consequences of a rejection of the Gospel of

John. But when such a man as Schleiermacher* felt himself so little moved by Bretschneider's doubts, that while expressing an opinion that it was well they had come under discussion, he said, nevertheless, that they were unimportant and had not troubled him for a moment; this only shewed how prejudiced on this point this critic, otherwise so sharp-sighted, was, and how subjective his whole system of criticism had become. He declared the Revelation of John, in defiance of the most respectable evidence, to be not genuine, because in matter and form it contradicted his tone of thought; in the case of the Gospel of John, he could pass lightly over important grounds of suspicion, because he felt himself intimately identified with it. The Christ of John, who knows the Father in himself, and himself as one with the Father, who says and does nothing of himself, but only what the Father bids him do and say, appeared to agree with Schleiermacher's religious ideal, a divine consciousness, which, working without obstacle, resembles an existence of God in man; the Gospel of John was therefore the means by which Schleiermacher's modern piety coincided with Christianity; and the more indispensable this support was, the less he was inclined to give a hearing to doubts which called in question the validity of the Gospel as a genuine representation of Christ.

It is remarkable how this uncritical error in respect of the sources of the history of Jesus is only a parallel to a similar one as to the sources of the history of Socrates. Schleiermacher, in one of those later remarks to which he endeavoured cautiously to limit or to modify the exaggerations contained in his lectures, is obviously provoked by Bretschneider's attack upon his favourite Gospel, and allows himself to be carried away so far as to say that he leaves it to us to explain†

* In his *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 318 ff.

† *Orations on Religion*, p. 442, third ed.

(on the supposition of the rejection of the Gospel of John) how a Jewish Rabbi with a few charitable ideas, something of the morality of Socrates, a few miracles, or at least what others take for such, and the art of producing neat maxims and parables—for that there is nothing more, and that even some follies would have to be excused in him—how a person like this could have produced such an effect as the foundation of a new Religion and a new Church, seeing that if he had been only this and nothing more he would not have been fit to hold the candle to Moses and Mahomet. In this assault upon the synoptic Christ, the reader will be offended, above all, at the romantic preference which regards what is simple, natural, and without any touch of equivocation, “melancholy,” or “irony,” as too common and vulgar. But he will at once remember how Schleiermacher, with exactly the same preference, depreciated the Socrates of Xenophon as compared with the Socrates of Plato. If Socrates, he remarked in his well-known discussion “On the Work of Socrates as a Philosopher,” had employed himself only upon speeches of the value and extent beyond which the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon do not go, even though they had been more beautiful and brilliant in point of form, one cannot conceive that he would not have emptied the market-place and work-shops, the public walks and the gymnasia, by the fear of his presence; one cannot imagine how he could have satisfied, for so many years, an Alcibiades and a Critias, a Plato and a Euclid; how, in short, he could have been the founder and the example of Athenian philosophy. From this point of view it will appear very considerate in Schleiermacher not to have apprehended that a merely synoptic Jesus might have emptied the shores of the sea of Galilee, and the synagogues of the localities around. But then there is the suggestion, long since made by critics of more historical feeling, that the description of Socrates given by Xenophon must lie at the bottom of the historical conception of the philosopher, and that from the

representation of him by Plato only separate supplementary features must be taken, and that with caution. And this may be considered as a satisfactory hint for the settlement of this evangelical question also.

Schleiermacher, however, did not stand alone in the position he assumed towards the Gospel of John. There were a large number of his contemporaries, these not being the first, who, having been educated in his doctrine, had made his Christ their own; but the whole generation which had grown up in Romanticism and the combined philosophy of Fichte and Schelling, found the mystic ideal Gospel of John more suitable to their views than the historical realism of the first three. And it was because the author of the "Probabilia" endeavoured to swim against the current of this stream that his book was unfortunate. Bretschneider, by education and tone of thought, belonged to the old rationalistic school of Kant; the spirit of practical morality in the first three Gospels, and their clear simple form, was as suitable to him as the speculative exaggeration and the mystical twilight in the fourth were offensive. He called attention to the former so pointedly, that in contrast with the school of Schleiermacher he seemed a man beyond his age: he did not conceal this, and it gave him the appearance of one who had no power of appreciating the depth of the Gospel in question. For all whom Schleiermacher's spirit had possessed, for the Lückes, the Hases, the Neanders, or by whatever name they might be called, the apostolical origin of the Gospel of John remained the corner-stone of their theology, the "Probabilia" a still-born theory; De Wette alone held his judgment in suspense, but only at last to allow his critical consciousness to be swallowed up in the intellectual current to which he had approached.

16. FURTHER TREATISES ABOUT THE FIRST THREE GOSPELS, AND THEIR RELATION TO THE FOURTH. SCHULZ, SIEFFERT, SCHNECKENBURGER; MY OWN CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

After this fruitless interlude, the Gospel of John seemed to stand firmer than ever. And thus the investigations with regard to the first three advanced so much the more freely, and it was precisely the one among them which, like the fourth, bore upon the front of it the name of an Apostle, that fell by degrees more and more into disfavour. In his treatise upon Luke, Schleiermacher, with the prepossession of an ingenious man for the subject which he is analysing, thought he had discovered in different passages that sometimes the account, sometimes the arrangement of Luke, deserve the preference before those of Mark. To another liberal theologian, the forgiveness of sins, which certainly Matthew alone, among the Evangelists, introduces into the words of the institution of the Last Supper, was such an offence, that, in a separate appendix to his work upon the latter, he exhibited, in a collected form, his doubts as to the authenticity of the Gospel of Matthew.* A few younger critics went further in this direction,† and it appeared for some time to be a decided point that the first among the Evangelists must become the last, that the pretended Gospel of Matthew must be placed, as regards originality and authenticity, not only below that of John, but also those of the two Apostles' assistants, Mark and Luke.

A number of indications was brought forward, from which it was supposed to be clear that the author of this Gospel could not possibly have been an eye-witness and companion

* Schulz, *Doctrine of the Holy Supper* (1824).

† Sieffert, *On the Origin of the First Canonical Gospel* (1832). Schneckenburger, *On the Origin of the First Canonical Gospel* (1834). Compare my remarks, in my review of these works, reprinted in my "Characteristics and Criticisms," p. 239 ff.

of Jesus. The first of these was the want of vividness and detail in his accounts. Even Schleiermacher, in his Lectures upon the Introduction to the New Testament, used to make a fine remark upon this particular point. In the ninth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, he said, it is recounted how Jesus called Matthew to be an Apostle, and how the latter followed him, *i.e.* attached himself to his regular retinue. Now it might be supposed that if the Evangelist who tells this was really the Apostle then called, some difference must have been observable in the manner in which he narrates, before his call and after; his narrative must have been, from the time when he himself took part in everything, more vivid, more real, more circumstantial. But no trace of a difference is discoverable; his style of description continues subsequently as summary, his accounts of time and place as indefinite, as before. It must be evident, even without comparing the Gospel of Matthew with the others, that this is not the manner of an eye-witness, but of one who takes his statements from the gliding stream of tradition; on the other hand, when critics thought to strengthen their proof to his disadvantage, by pointing to the fact that the other Evangelists generally tell their story much more circumstantially and more vividly, the question arose whether this was really the vivid description of an eye-witness, and not rather of one who seeks to freshen up an account received in a summary form by a free application of colouring.

The large groups of speeches peculiar to it were alleged as a further reason against the apostolical origin of the first Gospel. It represents, it was said, Jesus as saying at one time what he obviously said at different times and on different occasions, and what, therefore, even Luke and Mark distribute over different parts of the Gospels. Thus the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew, chap. v. 7), the instructions to the Apostles (chap. x.), the long speech against the Pharisees (chap. xxiii.), contain component parts which were not originally spoken in

this connection, but were placed there by the compiler on account of a certain resemblance in substance or expression. So likewise the seven parables, chap. xiii., look rather as if they had been combined by him simply as parables, than thus delivered in a group, though the Evangelist expressly says they were. This cannot be mistaken, and is now scarcely denied. On the other hand, even in this case, the appeal to Mark and Luke, who are supposed to arrange some of these speeches much better, and give their probable occasions, was not decisive, as it may be proved that Mark especially has often thrown into complete disorder speeches that were in Matthew properly placed in succession, while Luke has absolutely invented the occasion for many sayings of Jesus, which he took out of the longer utterances in Matthew. And if Matthew was attacked on account of his groups of speeches, how did it happen that the long speeches of Christ in John did not occur to the critics, being, as they are, much more open to suspicion than the others? For to combine into one delivery what was spoken at different times, is an easier mistake, and more possible for a listener, than to do as Bretschneider has proved the fourth Gospel does, that is, to put speeches in the mouth of Jesus which suppose a knowledge of the philosophy of a later age, or to mix up the pretended words of Jesus with the Evangelist's own reflections in such a manner that one often does not know whether the one or the other is the speaker.

Further, it is objected to the author of the first Gospel that he doubled persons and events—two blind men, two lepers, two possessed of devils, Mark and Luke having only one, two miraculous feastings, while Luke and John know of only one. Now this does no doubt very decidedly shew the author of the first Gospel to have been a man who, in two separate sources which lay before him, found the same stories differently arranged, and told with somewhat different circumstances, and on account of this difference considered each

narrative as a separate history, and therefore adopted both with his Gospel, a mistake only possible to one who was at a distance from the events themselves. But, on the other hand, it is far from following as a matter of course, that a writer who, like Luke and John, was careful not to commit this obvious mistake, was therefore either an eye-witness himself, or instructed by an eye-witness.

And so also in the matter of the speeches, the fourth Evangelist is open to a more extensive accusation than the first, the accusation, namely, of having mixed up with his historical narrative, features from passages in the Prophets, and in some cases in consequence of a misconstruction of them. It is a misconstruction of the passage in Zechariah ix. 9, where Matthew represents Jesus as riding into Jerusalem on two asses, the dam and the foal. It is also quite as much a misconstruction of Psalm xxii. 19, when John, xix. 23 ff., differing from the other Evangelists, separates the drawing of lots for his vesture as something distinct from the parting of the garments of Jesus.

Lastly, it was held as decisive against the Gospel of Matthew, that the author of it knows nothing of different events of which an Apostle must necessarily have known; and among these are brought forward as instances, the selection of the seventy disciples, the visible ascension, the several journeyings to the feast, the raising of Lazarus. But of the first two points, the Gospel of John knows no more than that of Matthew; of the two others, it certainly knows something; but the question arises whether it does not know more than occurred, *i.e.* whether both accounts are not unhistorical, but capable of explanation from the remoteness of the fourth Gospel from the events, and the peculiar tendency of the writer.

From this point a process of comparison, applied to all the four Gospels, appeared requisite. None of these were to be considered, as that of John had been up to the last, as

genuine and apostolical, but, without any assumption in the first instance, their accounts were to be tried each for itself, and all in comparison with one another, and it was to be decided accordingly whether to any one among them, and if so, to which, the validity of a record, either of apostolic origin, or at all events derived from the apostolic age, was to be accorded. Such a process, which I had already indicated in a criticism of the treatises upon the Gospel of Matthew, on which I have just given an opinion, I endeavoured to carry out in my *Life of Jesus*, and the result as to all four Gospels was a negative one. That is, their narratives throughout were to be considered, not the accounts of eye-witnesses, but only fragmentary notes recorded by men who lived at a distance from the events, and who, though they penned down many authentic notices and speeches, collected also all sorts of legendary traditions, and embellished them in part by inventions of their own.

Now in doing this, my tactics were by no means, as Baur has objected, to overthrow the Synoptics by means of John, and then John by means of the Synoptics, and thereby to make it impossible to know what is true in the evangelical history, and what is false.* But my object was to combat the critics above mentioned, and to prove the Gospel of Matthew to be that which has most historical value; and, on the other hand, that of John to be the one on which, as history, least reliance is to be placed, in which the process of the ideal modification of the evangelical material has gone the furthest, the greatest exaggeration both of the idea of miracle, and of conception of Christ, is to be found. Thus I prepared the ground upon which Baur also subsequently took his stand. And Baur is not satisfied, and justly not so, with mere degrees of credibi-

* *Critical Examination of the Canonical Gospels*, p. 71. *Church History of the Nineteenth Century*, p. 397. Comp. Keim, *Academical Inauguration Lecture*, p. 12.

lity, but wishes for the discovery of absolute indications by which the different Gospels are distinguished from one another. I have, accordingly, in various passages in my *Life of Jesus*, drawn attention, as others have to some extent before me, to the prophetic pragmatism of Matthew, the historical of Luke, the tendency of the first to combine traditional utterances of Jesus with larger groups of speeches, of the latter to provide individual sayings with fictitious occasions, to the exaggerated manner and far-fetched picturesqueness of Mark, and the like; but most especially have I represented the Gospel of John, on the one hand as the culminating point of the evangelical mythification; and on the other, as a peculiar production differing from all the others. And this view forced itself upon me, particularly in the case of the speeches of Jesus given in John. While the first three Evangelists were satisfied with dividing and arranging the material of the speeches handed down to them, each in his own way, with now and then modifying it, or introducing something of their own, an examination of the speeches of John in the fourth Gospel resulted in my recognising in them absolute inventions of the Evangelist, at the bottom of which there might lie, in the best of cases, certain main thoughts of the actual speeches of Jesus, but even these metamorphosed in the spirit of Alexandrine philosophy.

But also the peculiar pedantry in the narrative of the fourth Gospel, the gross and ever-recurring misunderstandings of the speeches of Jesus on the part of the Jews and his disciples, the plots against his life, laid from an early period of it, and again and again without result,—all this appeared to me as something fictitious; Nicodemus, an unreal person; the relation between Peter and John purposely adapted to give precedence to the latter; the scene with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well I had pointed out as absolutely a poetic fiction; and the impossibilities in the narrative of the

raising of Lazarus as affording a proof that the Gospel does not belong to the class of historical compositions.* And however readily I admit that on all these heads Baur has advanced to more definite results, that his investigations have formed a necessary supplement to, in some points have even corrected, my own, still it is manifest that he only continued what I began, but did not undertake what I had omitted. He objected to me that I gave a criticism of the evangelical history without a criticism of the Gospels. With the same justice or injustice conversely, I might accuse him of having given a criticism of the Gospels without a criticism of the evangelical history.† At any rate, it is impossible that the general remarks to which he has confined himself in this last respect can be satisfactory; on the contrary, out of what he has done for the criticism of the Gospels, the necessity results of subjecting the evangelical history itself to a fresh criticism.

17. ATTEMPTS TO DISCOVER AN AUTHENTIC AND UNAUTHENTIC ELEMENT IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL. WEISSE, SCHWEITZER, RENAN.

In my critical discussion of the Life of Jesus, I compared and tested the four Gospels; I exposed the contradictions and shewed the inadmissibility of all attempts to harmonise

* In two cases I did not venture to decide between the statement of the Synoptics and that of John. The first case was the fixing of the day of the death of Jesus. But this only on the understanding that possibly neither of the accounts might be historical. The second case was on the question, whether Jesus, during his public ministry, was once at Jerusalem or several times. On this I now decide, indeed, with Baur, for the first three Evangelists, but not until I consider that I have set aside in a manner more satisfactory than he did the point that in my eyes told most in favour of the fourth Gospel. Of this I shall speak in its proper place.

† Critical Examination of the Canonical Gospels, pp. 41, 71. Comp. the Church History of the Nineteenth Century, p. 399.

them; I estimated the amount of their credibility in every individual point of the evangelical history. The result of this estimation was in almost every case unfavourable to the fourth Gospel, and the consequence was that the confidence hitherto placed in the Gospel became considerably shaken. It was impossible for this Gospel to be looked upon in future, as it had been before, as the highest authority; it was impossible, as formerly, to contrast John with the first three Evangelists as undoubtedly an eye-witness, compared with whom they must always be in the wrong. Those champions who still attempted to do this were not able to restore the former feeling of confidence; nay, were without it themselves, as might be seen most plainly in the position taken up by Lücke in the third edition of his Commentary on the Gospel of John. That writer, by making the largest admission with reference particularly to the speeches of Jesus in the Gospel, endeavours in vain to fortify the remainder, and at last could not conceal from himself that it is precisely the fourth Gospel, as distinguished from the others, which has much that creates difficulty peculiar to itself.

Still the question was not to be allowed to drop so entirely as criticism desired. There was something attractive in the Gospel—something for which, as it was expressed, an evidence of the Holy Spirit was supposed to be felt in the heart of hearts, and which, consequently, there was an inclination to receive as an apostolical Word of God. There was, therefore, in the same work something attractive and repulsive, something that could not be received, and something that would not be missed. Thus it was worth trying whether the two sorts of component parts could not be separated from one another, the one being attributed to the Apostle and eye-witness, the other to a later writer, whose authority no one would recognise. Hitherto the Gospel of John had certainly been held by both parties, the champions as well as the opponents of its apostolical origin, to be a work

from one mould; but the same thing had also formerly prevailed with regard to the first three Gospels. Of these, now, and of Matthew and Luke in particular, it might be considered to be the prevailing view that they were made up of different component elements, and only brought by repeated touches into their present form. It was, therefore, quite rational to consider the notion of original unity in the case also of the Gospel of John as a mere prejudice, by no means binding, if a more thorough investigation gave a different result.

The question to be asked, said Weisse,* is not—Is the Gospel of John authentic? but, What in it is authentic? To which he answers, That which in its aspect and mode of representation is connected with the first Epistle of John, which is proved by external evidence to be a work of the Apostle John. As regards the style, in the first place, Weisse discovers a connection between this Epistle and the doctrinal or contemplative parts of the Gospel, a connection not to be explained, he says, by imitation, but only by supposing an identity of author. That such a connection does not appear in the case of the narrative portions of the Gospel might, according to him, be discovered even by an unprejudiced person, inasmuch as the Epistle offers no narrative portions for comparison; but he adds, that between the Epistle and the narratives in the Gospel there exists a contradiction as regards mode of thought and view of the subject-matter, which points to a different author of these last component parts. He thinks that the Epistle, as well as the preface and the longer speeches of Christ in the Gospel, is perfectly free from all that sensuous supra-naturalistic belief in miracles which we have to complain of in the narratives of the Gospel, and filled throughout only with a spiritual ideal conception

* Evangelical History (1838). The Question of the Gospels in its Present Stage (1856). Comp. also his Philosophical Dogmatism.

of Christ and the power of the Spirit in him; also, that the resurrection of Christ in particular is in the Epistle, and the farewell speeches of the Gospel, conceived as spiritually as it is materially in the narrative of its 20th chapter.

Here a glance is at once opened for us into the purely subjective motive for this distinguishing criticism. In order to give itself an objective character, it appeals to the Epistle of John, the authenticity of which is quite as questionable as that of the Gospel; and where the style has failed it as a criterion, it holds by the dogmatic view, in which, however, it might dispense with the Epistle, and simply stand by the opposition which in this respect seems to exist between the speeches and the narratives of the Gospel. Of these two component parts, apparently of a different character, the critic does not like the narrative, in part certainly by reason of its contrast with the synoptic, which carries with it in general the appearance of an historical character, but principally on account of the glaring manner in which the supernaturalistic idea of miracle is brought out in it. Again, he is displeased with the interlocutory speeches because they are partly absurd in many ways, by reason of the incredible misunderstandings, and partly inseparable from the stories of the miracles as having been the occasions of them. On the other hand, he likes the doctrinal matter of the Gospel, and not only the Evangelist's own reflections, but also the longer speeches of Christ; and thus the doctrinal pieces are supposed as a matter of course to come from the Apostle, and the narrative, together with the interlocutory portions, to have been worked up by a later hand. We, also, consider the character of these latter portions to be incompatible with the probability that the author of them was an eye-witness: the only question is, what induces our critic to separate other portions of the Gospel from these, and to attribute them to the Apostle? He likes the doctrinal element of the Gospel because it contains, as he says, the purely ideal doctrine of

the incarnation of the divine Logos in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, perfectly free not only from the mythical additions of the Synoptics, but also from the supra-naturalistic faith in miracles of the later editor of the Gospel itself.

But then, this doctrine of the humanization of the divine Logos, of the creative Word which in the beginning was with God, and also itself God, which during its transitory sojourn in the flesh did not lose the remembrance of its glorious existence with God, before all worlds, to which existence it hopes in a short time to return—is not this sheer supra-naturalism, to which all separate stories of miracles, however glaring they may be, stand in the relation of intelligible consequences? No, answers Weisse; for that this humanization, according to the doctrine of the Apostle, is not the miraculous incorporation in a human body of a divine person already existing in a limited form near the person of the Father, but neither more nor less than the complete identification of the living personality of the Godhead with the soul and spirit of an individual human being, from whose outward personal form accordingly the glory of this personality shines forth; and we are taught in the Old Testament to distinguish between the personality and the personal I of this Godhead, without, however, dividing the former from the latter as a separate person. In fact, therefore, the doctrinal matter of the Gospel of John does not, in its objective form, satisfy our dilettante, until he has moulded it in his own mouth and made of it a thing of which probably he understands as little as his readers do. If, therefore, Weisse were a better interpreter than he is, *i.e.* if it were less easy to him to employ a capricious explanation in order to make what is objectively before him smooth and straight for himself, and if he were a better philosopher than he is, *i.e.* if his philosophy stood upon its own legs and had not recourse to religious crutches, he could not fail to be as much scandalized by the doctrine of the Gospel of John as by its historical narrative, and

would abandon the former wholly and entirely to its critical fate: the reason why he now does so only partially is solely subjective.

Now, as regards the more definite completion of Weisse's view, he supposes that the Apostle John, in his latter days, in order to preserve the vanishing remembrance of his Master's person, made notes partly from his own reflections about him, partly from speeches of Jesus; in the latter case, however, only as they survived in his own mind after a lapse of time, modified by his own form of thought and expression. Then that after the Apostle's death a disciple of his came and endeavoured, though with but little skill, to work up into an evangelical narrative the studies which the Apostle had left behind. This he did partly from recollection of his oral teaching, partly from more extended evangelical tradition, being unacquainted with our synoptic Gospels, as he lived in an exclusive circle of disciples of John. This theory was not new: for before this, Ammon, Rettig, and others, had already separated the compiler and editor from the Apostle John, as the composer of the notes that were the foundation of the Gospel. How much in the present Gospel belongs to one or the other of the two composers, Weisse had already stated, in a preliminary way, in his "Evangelical History," which appeared in the year 1838. This essay, however, he had himself allowed to drop as an over-hasty production, and devoid of scientific value. He had at that time a more accurate performance in prospect; but the sagacity was wanting which might have enabled him to restore the genuine work of John, perfectly and word for word, from the re-touched edition of the evangelical narrator. But Weisse laid the blame of this failure, not upon the perversity of his own idea, but upon the capricious proceeding of the supposed editor, who had introduced his own additions among the words of the Apostle's original record. Then, not satisfied with this, he had also partly modified, partly changed that record, and also worked

into the portions of narrative inserted by him fragments of notes from his own hand. One is naturally compelled to ask how Weisse would attempt to distinguish the apostolical foundation from the interpolations, if, on the one hand, that foundation has been changed in many ways by the interpolator, and, on the other, apostolical portions are supposed to be contained in the matter interpolated. But Weisse, far from seeing this, sets himself to the task of working out, as well as he can, the theory of separation.

The notes of the Apostle John are supposed to have consisted partly of speeches of Jesus, partly of reflections of his own; and thus Weisse finds in the first chapters of the Gospel elements of a set of the latter, in the later chapters traces of a record of the former kind. The preface, above all, is supposed to be taken from the contemplative sets of the Apostle's notes. Now in this preface, from beginning to end, other people find the difficulty of not being able to conceive how the Galilean fisherman, the Apostle and pillar of the Jewish Christian party, should have come to the knowledge of the Alexandrine philosopheme of the Logos, and to the perfectly free development of mind thereby made possible. But Weisse complacently recognises this speculative exposition contained in the five first verses as apostolic, because he can bring it into apparent harmony with his own philosophising. Now the preface, in verses 6—8, comes to speak of the Baptist with manifest reference to the fuller description of him in the Gospel; and as this description, as Weisse thinks he sees, is such as no Apostle and former disciple of the Baptist can have given, those verses of the preface do not appear to him to be apostolical, but must have been interpolated by the editor. In verses 9—14, where the speculation goes on again, our philosopher supposes the Apostle to be speaking; ver. 15, which comes back to the Baptist, the interpolator; ver. 16, where an eye-witness

seems to be speaking, is awarded to the Apostle; but immediately in the following verse, the mention of Moses with his law will not suit the preface, being, as it is after the ejection of the Baptist, purely speculative, and it is therefore put to the account of the editor; while the last, ver. 18, is again supposed to be apostolical. Thus, then, the preface of John, a performance which, viewed without prejudice, proceeds in the best order and the strictest connection, which has unmistakeably the appearance of containing one single fundamental thought, to say nothing of that of one single author, is cut up into no less than seven morsels, supposed alternately to come from two different writers; a result which is of itself decisive against the hypothesis from which it comes.

In what follows, partly the narrative, partly the interlocutory portions are, as additions of the editor, taken out of connection with the reflections and longer speeches. As regards the first, the reader is called upon himself to observe that the speeches and reflections cannot originally have been connected with them, though it is perfectly clear that the most important of the speeches, such as those in chaps. v. vi. ix., are nothing but essays upon the narrative which, like a subject as it were, is placed immediately before them; while as to the interlocutory portions, we are assured that they can be separated off with ease, without a shadow of proof that such a separation generally is requisite and justifiable. And we are meanwhile continually told that it is far from being maintained that the original work of the Apostle can be restored by cutting out the interpolations, that the editor, who took such liberties, may also have taken more, *i.e.* have altered the apostolical records, not merely by interpolation, but also by actual changes of these records themselves, but that this circumstance is without prejudice to the evidence of the fact that such records from the Apostle's hand did

really exist. And thus we turn with displeasure from a performance which itself admits its own untenability and groundlessness, and yet will not abandon the object which it has in view.

After an attempt at division which had ended so unsuccessfully, there seemed to be no alternative but to recognise the Gospel of John as either entirely apostolical, or not at all so. But the motives for making the division were so closely connected with a spirit at that time widely spread, that we cannot be surprised at others thinking that it was only necessary to handle the thing more skilfully in order to be able to carry it out. Weisse's method, of contrasting the speeches as apostolical with the narratives and dialogues as added by a later hand, could not, according to Schweizer,* succeed, because the speeches are for the most part inseparably connected with the preceding dialogues, and these with the narratives. But Schweizer, too, thought he discovered in the Gospel the work of two hands and two minds, standing to each other in the relation of a higher point of view and a lower. He too was repelled from a portion of the Gospel of John by the exaggerated notion of miracles which appears in it, by the more objective mode of apprehension which seemed not to harmonise with the ideal spirit of the rest of the Gospel. With him also the dividing line between what is apostolical and not apostolical includes the longer speeches, with the exception of some interpolations, as containing the ideal spirit; but it does not, like that drawn by Weisse, exclude all narratives and the interlocutory portions. The latter Schweizer can deal with as unobjectionable: in narratives such as the Washing of the Feet, the Anointing, the history of the Passion generally, he discovers the decisive eye-witness stamp, and even the accounts of miracles he only finds to be partially such that he

* The Gospel of John critically examined according to its Internal Value, and its Importance for the Life of Jesus (1841).

cannot conceive the possibility of their having come from an Apostle.

According to Schweizer's discovery, the miracles narrated in the fourth Gospel fall into two very distinct classes. Independent of those which cannot be considered as real miracles at all, the one class, he says, consists of those that are indeed mysterious, in fact difficult, but still such that sometimes a physical, sometimes a mental, cause may be supposed. Thus Jesus seeing Nathanael under the fig-tree may have been a perfectly natural event; the discovery of the mode of life of the Samaritan woman might have been possible for one acquainted with the hearts of men from mere natural observation of her behaviour; the sick man at the pool of Bethesda might have been one crippled by a devil, whom John does not name by his right name only out of consideration for his Grecian readers; in the case of persons possessed, even criticism admits the possibility of a mental cure; and even in the case of the man born blind, we are not compelled to suppose circumstances which would have absolutely excluded a natural cure. But when Jesus, as the same Gospel tells us, is supposed to have changed water into wine, a small stock of provisions into a large one, to have healed a sick man lying at Capernaum by a word spoken at Cana, and to have walked upon the sea of Galilee;—to these cases no sort of rational cause can be imagined, and thus these are magical, supernatural miracles which—and here Schweizer might indeed have said he cannot himself believe—but which he does say the author of the speeches of Jesus in the fourth Gospel cannot have told.

And now, when he considers the case more accurately, it happens remarkably enough that the miracles which appear credible to the critic all fall to Jerusalem and Judea, all the incredible ones to Galilee; and thus his criticism, hitherto subjective, seems to gain an objective support. For now it becomes clear to him all at once that the plan of the original

apostolical work was only to describe the extra-Galilean ministry of Jesus in such a manner as to represent that, in connection with the chronology of the Feasts, Jesus did indeed return three times to Galilee, but that the composer entirely passed over in silence what took place there, and only continued his narrative when Jesus, on occasion of a festival, left Galilee afresh. Whether an author who laid so much stress on the ministration of Jesus in Judea must not himself be supposed to be a Jew, and whether the education displayed in the Gospel would not be more probable in the case of such a person than in that of a fisherman from Galilee—this question forces itself here upon the critic, and it is not absolutely negatived by him; only, he says, that it is not impossible to conceive the son of Zebedee to have been the author, and even if he should prove to have been an adherent of Jesus out of Judea, he must in any case have been an eye-witness. And then he says that the author of this original record undoubtedly transferred it out of a more eastern region, and that after his death a disciple only slightly initiated into his spirit found it necessary to accommodate it to the Galilean tradition prevailing in the more western districts, by interpolating Galilean stories between the Jewish and Samaritan.

But among the Galilean portions, referred by Schweizer to the secondary hand who stands upon the lower ground, is found also the speech in the synagogue at Capernaum, xi. 27 ff., which, with its exposition about the Bread of Life and the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of the Son of Man, is certainly in the highest style of the mysticism of John. On the other hand, among the Jewish narratives, and these, consequently, decided by Schweizer to be credible and apostolic, the miracle of the raising of Lazarus is found, which however is certainly as difficult and as little to be accounted for either physically or mentally, as any of the miraculous stories rejected by him and attributed to the later

editor. It is therefore maintained about this speech, with the most *extrême* caprice, that it was really delivered in the temple at Jerusalem, as a continuation of the utterances of the fifth chapter; while the raising of Lazarus is made a natural revival from his apparent death, which, with bold confidence on the part of Jesus in the hearing of his prayer, coincided with the offering of it. With such an explanation of miracles as this, it is no longer possible to see what difficulty these Galilean miracles, which have the most magical appearance, can present; and indeed Schweizer hints at a natural explanation of Jesus' walking on the sea. Thus it becomes a question in what, on the other hand, the precedence of the extra-Galilean stories of miracles in the Gospel of John before those of Galilee is supposed to consist, so that they, as distinguished from these latter, are discovered to be credible and apostolical. The preference results from this, that the Galilean stories, as has been already hinted, are objected to on rationalistic grounds; in the case of miracles of supernatural knowledge, natural observation is foisted in; in the case of the sick man at the pool of Bethesda, the thirty-eight years of his sickness are set aside as a groundless assumption on the part of the Evangelist; in the case of Lazarus, a mere appearance of death; in that of the man born blind, circumstances are assumed which only required a skilful physician in order to be perfectly curable. Under such a process as this, the appeal to secret powers of healing, resembling the destructive powers of disease which, when they have existed for centuries without any effect of them being noticeable, re-appear all at once under unknown conditions—this comparison of the healing powers of Jesus with hereditary disease, is as unnecessary as it is only mere pretence, when Schweizer says that it is not reluctance to acknowledge miracles that is the motive of his attempt at division. He and his followers professedly shrink only from magical or absolute miracles; but this means just those which

are real miracles, and which cannot by any means be explained psychologically, or otherwise naturally, *i.e.* in a manner which a theologian of this stamp imposes upon himself so far as to consider natural. But by such a process as that of Schweizer, all may be thus explained, and it is therefore even from his own subjective point of view unnecessary, for the sake of one portion of miraculous stories in John (for without that principal ground of suspicion he would certainly soon have settled his other doubts respecting certain parts of the Gospel) to undertake such a separation.

And to what does the whole operation come, when at last, in that portion of the Gospel which is connected with Jerusalem, and is therefore, according to the hypothesis, apostolical, the critic is met by a narrative characterized by the exact opposite to all that ideal and spiritual tone which he elsewhere holds up to admiration in his apostolical record, and especially in the case of the resurrection? We mean the narrative in which the risen Jesus first shews his hands and his side to the disciples, and then bids the doubting Thomas to put his fingers into the wounds, and so appears to have risen in a material or corporeal manner, which is exactly the way in which Schweizer will not allow him to have risen. "If this portion were not from John," he naively says, "much that is difficult would be at once explained." He then tries to shake the connection between this account and that which precedes it, but at last does not venture to declare it to be an interpolation. And thus, as this account upsets his theory of the purely spiritual and ideal character of the apostolical record, and consequently destroys the motive for his attempt at separation, this whole method of solving the enigma of the Gospel of John, itself disposes of itself.

That very lately so subtle a writer as Renan was bold enough to increase the number of these unfortunate attempts at separation, can be accounted for only from this circum-

stance, that he was not immediately acquainted with those that had been made in Germany, and their ill success. So, if he knew of those, he must have sagaciously reasoned thus—that any one taking up the opposite hypothesis to Weisse's could not go wrong. For, in fact, while Weisse assumed the reflections and longer speeches of Christ in the fourth Gospel to be apostolical, rejecting on the one hand the narratives as a late compilation, Renan, conversely, takes offence at the abstract metaphysical lectures, as he calls the speeches of Jesus in John, and, on the contrary, considers the narrative portion of the Gospel as extremely important, and therefore inclines, though only with hesitation, to the supposition that these speeches were not, indeed, written by the son of Zebedee, but that the general historical plan, as well as a series of separate statements of the Gospel, come mediately or immediately from the Apostle.* Now if there can be degrees of impossibility, the genuineness of the speeches of Christ in John is certainly to some extent even more inconceivable than that of the historical narrative; that is, it will be from the speeches most immediately that every one with a sound understanding, and capable of appreciating historic truth, will get the first rays of light as to the late origin of the fourth Gospel; but still it is the common ground of its divisibility, upon which Renan places himself with his German predecessor, which also makes his hypothesis untenable from first to last. The narrative part of the fourth Gospel is only tolerable to him, because from the very first he takes no accurate notice of the miraculous narratives in it. The raising of Lazarus, indeed, he cannot well pass by; and as he will have nothing to do with a miracle, he makes of it a mystification, which has drawn upon him, on the part of German criticism, the name of a second Venturini; and with

* *Vie de Jesus*, pp. xxiv ff., 156 ff. Far more correct views of the origin and character of the fourth Gospel are found in the work *Les Evangiles*, par Gustave d'Eichthal (1863), pp. xxv ff., 9 ff., 19 ff.

regard to this, in fact, one cannot but feel surprise that it did not open his eyes as to the falsehood of the hypothesis from which it comes.

18. BAUR'S EXAMINATION OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN CONTINUED.

So there was an end of admissions and divisions. Not that criticism abandoned any part of her pretensions, or that the Gospel surrendered its claim to apostolical origin for any portion of its contents. The whole indivisible Gospel, advancing in all its strongly marked peculiarity, challenged criticism to an attack as decided, to a battle for life and death. In presence of this Gospel, it was incumbent upon criticism either to break in pieces all her weapons, and lay them at the feet of her antagonist, or force it to disavow all claim to historical validity. It was incumbent upon her to make it as possible to conceive this record to be a post-apostolical product, as it had been hitherto impossible to conceive it to be an apostolical work. It is the imperishable glory of the immortal Dr. Baur* to have taken up this combat, and fought it out in a way in which critical combats have been rarely fought before. He had borrowed many weapons from his predecessors, and also forged many for himself, and he wielded all with skill, force, and patience, until the battle was decided in favour of criticism, not indeed before the tribunals of the theologians, but before that of science.

Baur had this advantage above all over Bretschneider, that

* On the Composition and Character of the Gospel of John. In *Theolog. Annual*, 1844, in a corrected form in the *Critical Examination of the Canonical Gospels*, 1847. Comp. different treatises on the Gospel of John in the *Theological Annals*; also, *Christianity and the Christian Church of the First Three Centuries*, second edition, 1860, p. 146 ff.

his position, with regard to his object, was not merely negative. The latter, as we have seen, felt himself repelled from the Gospel of John, not merely on historical, but also on domestic grounds; its whole speculative tendency and mystical method was foreign and unintelligible to his sober mind. On the contrary, it was exactly with this side of it, the philosophical depth and Gnostic essence of the Gospel of John, that Baur had a natural sympathy. Acutely as he endeavoured to prove that it could not be considered as a source of history, he endeavoured as eagerly to bring into view its ideal spirit, its artistic finish. The negative critic treated the fourth Gospel, quite as much as the most apologetic believer could have done, as his favourite Gospel. In doing so he sometimes committed the same mistake which he was tempted to commit generally in developing the dogmatic meaning of writings of the New Testament, as well as those of the Fathers or Reformers. He translated the thoughts of the Evangelist into the forms of modern speculation, and thereby idealised them. And this process placed a welcome weapon in the hands of his opponents, without, however, any prejudice to the validity of his proof of the unhistorical character of the work.

In my critical discussion of the Life of Jesus, I came upon the fourth Gospel after the first three. I endeavoured to comprehend it, starting from them, and in analogy with them. Baur came immediately upon the fourth Gospel, and endeavoured to view it in its own individuality, in its distinction from the others. My fundamental notion, in regard to the unhistorical element in the Gospels, had been that of the myth, by which I understood investitures, resembling history, of original Christian ideas, fashioned in the legend which unconsciously invented them.

This formula, immediately applicable to the unhistorical parts of the first three Gospels, I was compelled to extend so far in the case of several narratives in the fourth, as to recog-

nise in them free, uncontrolled and conscious fiction. From this notion, which had at last forced itself upon one critic, the other took his start in considering the fourth Gospel. In his opinion, this Gospel was a religious fiction freely drawn, and he recognised its fundamental idea to be, the attempt to contrast the Jewish unbelief as the opposing principle of darkness, with the divine principle of light and life as it appeared in Jesus, and to bring out into full relief the combat between the two principles, as an historical process, advancing forwards from step to step; a fundamental idea upon which he also endeavoured to account for the discrepancies between this Gospel and the others, in respect of composition, of selection and modification of the evangelical matter. This point of view gave the critic undeniable advantages for the more thorough understanding of the fourth Gospel. But in the consideration of the first three Gospels it was sometimes disadvantageous to him, inasmuch as it made him assume the presence of more unity of plan and complete definiteness of purpose in these pre-eminently simple compositions, compiled as they are from various sources, than can, without violence, be proved to have existed in them.

A third point in which Baur surpassed his predecessors in the understanding of the fourth Gospel was the more accurate indication of the relations of time and development of which we must consider it to have been the product. The period was one of the most vivid excitement, occasioned by the rise of Gnosticism on the one hand, of Montanism on the other, and the efforts of the Church to keep clear of both extremes; occasioned too in a dogmatic point of view by the application of the idea of the Logos to the person of Christ, and in an ecclesiastical point of view by the dispute about the festival of Easter. The fourth Gospel, as Baur tries to shew, has a bearing upon all these tendencies and disputes of the period: it stands in the midst of all the opposing forces of the time, without, however, presenting in

itself in any way the definite colour of an opposition either temporal or local. It thus holds a position, central indeed, but never allows this central position to appear too decidedly; neither is there a want of character in it by reason of a spirit of accommodation; but still it combines the opposing tendencies in a higher unity, and, bearing all this in mind, we see the cause of the rapid and general support which the Gospel gained from all parties immediately on its first appearance.

Lastly, Baur points out how the author of the Gospel, under the conviction that he had apprehended the true spirit of Christianity and Christ better than the earlier Evangelists, hampered as they were with Judaism, might with the best conscience change the evangelical history in the spirit of his time, and put speeches into the mouth of Jesus corresponding to his own advanced Christian point of view. He points out, moreover, how he who was conscious of having apprehended and published to the world the inmost glory of Christ, might even feel himself justified, if not in giving himself out as the favourite and bosom-disciple of Jesus, still in allowing it to be plainly enough inferred. All this, the sum and upshot of Baur's treatise, affords a magnificent proof of a penetrating and searching criticism, and must make a deep and truly poetical impression upon every one who understands how to follow it.

A valuable finish to the researches of Baur into the fourth Gospel has been given by Köstlin in his treatise upon the pseudonymous literature of the most ancient Christian Church.* Köstlin had in many ways prepared the ground for this in his work upon the doctrine of John. The problem which the fourth Evangelist set himself, Köstlin declares to have been to bring about the revival of the evangelical history out of the spirit of an advanced period, a problem

* Theological Annual, 1851, p. 149 ff.

framed under the conviction that it was only possible in this way to bring to light the original foundation of that history. The composer had before him a rich store, partly of oral traditions about Jesus, partly of written Gospels, both of Jewish and Pauline tendencies, all differing from one another in many ways, and not as yet canonically confirmed: on the other side he stood himself, vividly, indeed, penetrated with the conviction of the sole truth and divinity of Christianity, but also bred up in ideas descended from Alexandrian and Gnostic sects, and, in particular, conscious of the idea of the Logos as that in which the whole most elevated view of Christianity finds its necessary keystone. All around him he saw, standing in direct opposition to each other, the old and the new, the Christianity of Judaism and heathendom, the letter and the spirit; and, recognising in the older Gospels the strongest supports of the former, he thought to encounter these upon their own ground, and in a new Gospel to make the past itself bear witness for the Spirit and for progress. To do this, it became necessary to extract what was essential out of the varied mass of matter in the earlier Gospels, the spirit out of the body of these historical narratives; to set aside what was merely moral as exoteric, and to exalt what was mystical as esoteric; to separate from the person of Jesus not merely everything that was Jewish, but, generally, everything that was humanly low and finite, to make the Infinite and Divine everywhere shine through, and even his passion and his death appear as voluntarily undertaken. And the Evangelist thought himself justified in this innovation by the Spirit whose support, according to the earlier Gospels, Jesus had promised to his followers. This Spirit, according to his apprehension, could be wanting to no one who loved Jesus and kept his commands (xiv. 22 ff.); and he was not merely to remind the faithful of everything which Jesus had spoken (xiv. 26), but also to glorify him in them, and to lead them to the right understanding of what in

Jesus' lifetime had been only imperfectly comprehended (xvi. 13, 14, 25). In possession of this Spirit, the Evangelist felt himself adapted, as well as empowered, to give a true representation of Jesus, his doctrine, and his ministration. If, as the Spirit taught him, the divine Logos had become flesh in Jesus, it was impossible that the historical narrative of the former Gospels could be correct; the state of the case with Jesus must have been otherwise, and indeed such as followed from the idea of the Logos, if that idea was combined with the evangelical material hitherto existing, that material being sifted, modified, and extended. Now, on this theory it was indeed impossible to avoid a contradiction. The Spirit was to furnish the disciples, *i.e.* the future faithful, with the higher knowledge at a future time, and not before. But it was out of this higher knowledge that not only the author wrote his Gospel, but also made the Christ he represented speak. What, therefore, the Spirit was first to give to the faithful, is already, before it is given, existing in Christ, and therefore between his speeches and the reflections of the Evangelist there is no distinction; the boundary-line between the two is either difficult to draw, or cannot be drawn at all.

Even so powerful an exposition of these views as Baur and his disciples* gave did not convince those to whom, either on internal or external grounds, the genuineness and credibility of the Gospel of John was a necessity. This is as self-evident as that the manner in which they endeavoured to defend themselves against its conclusions could have little scientific importance. They tried to weaken all the proofs upon which Baur rested his theory; they endeavoured to escape the menacing result through all the holes and chinks which his inferences had still left open. The single argument which Baur had taken up against the Johannine origin of the fourth

* Comp. especially Schwegler, *Post-apostolic Age* (1846), Part ii.; Hilgenfeld, *Gospel and Epistles of John explained in accordance with their Doctrine* (1849); *The Gospels*, p. 229 ff.

Gospel, founded upon the position adopted by John towards the Passover question, gave rise to a mass of literature. In all this, the comprehensive style in which Baur everywhere dealt with his subject afforded welcome pretexts to the parties seeking an escape. Supposing he had gained a result from a comprehensive critical combination, he would absolutely refuse to listen to the allegation of an individual passage or notice which might, at any rate, be brought up against it. And then, if he made short work of it, assuming for certain that it was impossible that such an isolated instance could be of any importance whatever, and there was a little violence in his way of setting it aside, all the peddlars in criticism cried out at such a piece of dishonesty in the accounts of the wholesale dealer—a piece of dishonesty which, considering the large figures with which he worked, could not be appreciated at all.

The loudest outcry naturally arose at the character of cheat with which the view of Baur invested the author of the Gospel, the literary imposture out of which it made one of the most precious jewels of the Christian Church to come. "If the Gospel of John is unauthentic, supposititious," cried an eminent zealot,* "then is our love changed into burning hatred; then is it for us no longer the spiritual Gospel that it was for Clement of Alexandria; not the one, tender, true, chief Gospel that it was for Luther; but the most tedious and dangerous compilation of a madman or impostor." These are indeed very inconsiderate expressions; for tediousness, absurdity, and the like, are surely terms applying to a work in and for itself, and are independent of the question as to the author: he who fears to find a work tedious, admits that it has before appeared to him tedious, but that he has not allowed this feeling to arise in him from respect for the supposed author. The Gospel of John will decline the admi-

* Schneider, on the Genuineness of the Gospel of John. First Contribution (1854).

ration of those worshippers who are so only as long as it bears this name, and whose admiration not only vanishes, but changes into disgust, as soon as it is deprived of that name. It will prefer those who know how to value it, let it come from whom it will.

Then comes another question. How is it conceivable that the author of a work so serious, of a spirit so soaring, penetrated by the deepest piety, should have been a cheat and an impostor, and consequently a bad man? But this question is corrected by another, which has been put, however, with the same tendency as the former: How is it conceivable that a man like the author of the fourth Gospel, capable of executing the greatest performance of his age, if he had come forward unmasked, should have condescended to such a trick in order to smuggle his ideas into the world? * What in the first question looks like an imposture, a wrong done to the Apostle, the second takes rather as a renunciation and disclaimer, which the author unnecessarily imposed upon himself. And it was, indeed, considered by the men of those times to be a renunciation, only not unnecessary, † but praiseworthy, for a writer thus to publish his work under another name. Neopythagoreans of the last century before Christ did, as may now be considered proved, attribute the sixty works partly to the founder, partly to old teachers of their school, in order, under the name of this Firm, to give later philosophemes the authority of the Master; and the Neopythagorean biographer of Pythagoras eulogises the authors for having renounced the fame that was their own, and attributed their works to the master of the school. A Christian of the second century wrote a legend about Paul and Thekla;

* Neander, *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 11.

† On this point, comp. Köstlin, *Pseudonymous Literature of the most Ancient Church*, in Zeller's *Theological Annual*, 1851, p. 149 ff.; The Tübingen Historical School in v. Sybel's *Historical Journal*, iv. 121 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Canon and Criticism of the New Testament*, p. 73 ff.

he was convicted of the fiction, but he declared that he had done what he did from love for Paul, and the Church continued to use his work, and celebrated on the strength of it a festival to these saints. Such was the judgment of that time of the whole, and, in particular, of later antiquity upon such a proceeding; and hence it comes that we have before us so many, and in some cases most valuable, books attributed by their real authors to famous names. The Book of Daniel is considered by none but persons of the most extravagant orthodoxy, the Book of the Wisdom of Solomon by no one at all, to be the works of the writers in whose persons they speak: but this does not diminish the respect we feel for the writers, so concealing themselves, of works of so solemn and pregnant a character. In the circles possessed by the religious movement, historical appreciation was wholly lost to that period of excited imagination when heathenism was passing away, Judaism being metamorphosed, and Christianity coming into existence. Then all was considered true that was edifying; all old that was found to give light; all apostolical that seemed worthy of an Apostle; and no one thought that he was doing a wrong to an Apostle, or even to Christ himself, but, on the contrary, every one considered that he was offering to either only the tribute due when he attributed to their lips or pens the best thing he knew of.* Accordingly, if the author of the fourth Gospel thought he had the true spirit, he shrank not from making Christ speak in this spirit, and that Apostle seemed to him to be best adapted to be the interpreter of this spirit, to whom the Lord, in the visions of the Apocalypse, had revealed the secrets of the future, and thereby declared to be his confidant and favourite—he considered himself justified in identifying himself in spirit with this Apostle in allowing his Gospel to appear as the work of this Apostle.

* As in the so-called Muratoric Fragment it is said of the Wisdom of Solomon, that it was *ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ejus scripta*.

19. RETROSPECTIVE VIEW OF THE THREE FIRST GOSPELS. MATTHEW.

Having reached this point of view for the understanding of the fourth Gospel, let us once more look at the three first.* And the main question which forces itself upon us is, whether we are justified in placing them upon the same ground as that Gospel. It is, as is well known, Baur's opinion, that when we have before us, though in the case of one Gospel only, the proof that a Gospel is not merely a simple historical account, but may also be a work with a tendency, this is the point of view generally from which criticism has to consider the Gospels.

Now that no one of the Gospels was written with the simple object of giving a history, but all of them with that of proving something, teaching something, setting up propaganda by what they tell, and that this purpose has not been without influence upon their representation of the history, that they are, so far, works with a tendency—this view is as old as the application of the higher criticism to these writings. And it is likewise a natural result that this purpose, although in general the same, that is to say, to prove Jesus to have been the Messiah, may still have been different in different Gospels, and consequently have modified the history differently, in so far as the idea of the Messiah admitted of being apprehended in different ways. But when the more advanced proposition was maintained, that not a single word in the writings of the Evangelists, not even the most insignificant, was selected by them without conscious purpose and an entirely special meaning, this proposition, maintained by the so-called Saxon Anonymous, is but a caricature of the view of Baur. Though perhaps it may be a question whether even Baur has not

* As to what follows, comp. Baur, *Critical Examination of the Canonical Gospels*; Schweigler, *Post-apostolic Age*, i.; Köstlin, *Origin and Composition of the Synoptic Gospels*; Hilgenfeld, *Gospels*.

sometimes looked for a direct purpose in the difference of one Evangelist from another, where nothing but inaccuracy, caprice, or accident, had been at work. His predecessor took his stand upon the first three Gospels, and may sometimes have looked upon the fourth as written with less tendency than it really was. Perhaps Baur fell into the opposite extreme. He formed his conception of the Gospels from the fourth. May he not consider the first three as more pregnant with a purpose and an object than they can properly be considered?

In the Acts of the Apostles it is well known that the course of events on the conversion of Paul is told three times over; once by the author (ix. 1—25), then again twice on different occasions by the Apostle himself (xxii. 1—21, xxvi. 4—23). In these narratives there are not unimportant discrepancies. According to one account, on the appearance of the light from heaven, Paul falls to the earth, his attendants remain standing; according to another, all fall to the ground; on one occasion, the attendants hear the voice, but see no one; on another, they see the light, but do not hear the voice; add to this, that in the second account there is the mention of an ecstasy in the Temple at Jerusalem, in the third a remarkable addition to the words of Jesus when he appears. Now if we read these three descriptions of the same occurrence in three different works, we may venture to say that not merely the Saxon Anonymous, but Baur as well, would attribute the discrepancies noticed to the different standpoint and purpose of the authors; whereas, being in one and the same work, they can only prove how carelessly the narrator went to work. In every instance in which he had to repeat the story, he told it freely out of his own imagination, without thinking of what had been written before.

In this, however, we are in perfect agreement with Baur, in opposition to those critics who rank the Gospels of Mark and Luke, either both or one of them, as the most ancient.

On the contrary, we, as well as Baur, have always considered, and still do consider, the Gospel of Matthew as the most original, and, comparatively speaking, the most trustworthy. As regards the speeches of Jesus in particular, notwithstanding all doubt upon individual points, every one must admit that we have them in the first Gospel, though not unmingled with later additions and modifications, still in a purer form than in any of the others. And all that relates to facts too appears, generally speaking, in this Gospel, in comparison with the others, in its simplest form. It is true, indeed, that the Gospel of Matthew has separate narratives peculiar to itself, the credibility of which is especially doubtful; as, for instance, that of Peter's walking on the sea, the coin in the mouth of the fish, the dream of Pilate's wife, the resurrection of the saints on the death of Jesus, the watch at his tomb. But these are mostly portions of history which the succeeding Evangelists might have had their motives for omitting, and from which therefore a later age for Matthew cannot be inferred. What he has in common with the others is in him generally told in the simplest form, and in such a manner that the representations given by the two others look like a re-touching or transformation of his. Let the reader compare, with this view, first the histories of the temptation and transfiguration, then most of the miraculous narratives, and he will scarcely be able to refuse assent to this proposition.

It is one also of the marks of the originality of the first Gospel that it bears, more than any other, the stamp of Jewish nationality. This, as time went on, and Christianity became more widely spread, naturally disappeared more and more. Jerusalem is to its author the "holy city," the Temple the "holy place;" while the others have just the name and nothing more, or other epithets. No Evangelist gives so accurate an account as he does of the relation assumed by Jesus to the Mosaic law, to Jewish usages and sects: and in

speaking of this he assumes as known what Mark thinks it necessary to explain. In the deeds and destinies of Jesus, he sees throughout the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies, and the coincidence is with him a principal proof that Christians are right in recognising in their Jesus the promised Messiah. Even Jesus himself appears in Matthew most intimately identified with Judaism. In no other Gospel is he so often called David's Son; in none has the genealogy, proclaiming his descent from David and Abraham, the same precedence of everything else; in none does he so industriously declare that he has come, not for the destruction, but for the fulfilment of the law.

But notwithstanding all these signs of higher antiquity, the first Evangelist is still but a writer at second-hand. Most probably he took the speeches in his Gospel from more ancient records; manifestly he did so in the case of at least part of what he describes as facts and occurrences. Several stories occur twice in his Gospel: this is the case with the miraculous feeding, the demand for a sign, the reproach of driving out devils by Beelzebub. And the only satisfactory explanation is, that the author had before him stories of this sort told with partially varying details, and therefore considered by him as different altogether.* And from this, at the same time, he appears to have been a writer of very little critical judgment or discrimination.

Meanwhile, those sections in the first Gospel which we must consider as derived from different sources, are far from standing to each other always in the relation of identical doublets. On the contrary, they are, not unfrequently, in contradiction to each other. In the instructions given to the Twelve on the first occasion of sending them out, Jesus forbids them to

* In this observation is involved the reason why I am unable to support the view of Hilgenfeld, that in the Gospel of Matthew we have to distinguish between one original document and a superstructure. The original document could contain only one feeding; I cannot conceive that to this the editor would have added a second out of his own imagination.

turn to heathens and Samaritans, as he had warned them in the Sermon on the Mount against giving what was holy to dogs, and pearls to swine, and he holds out a prospect of his return before they should have made the circuit of all the cities of Israel (vii. 6, x. 5 ff., 23). In other passages of the same Gospel, on the contrary, he not merely threatens the unbelieving Jews with the future calling of the heathen in their stead (xiii. 11 ff., xxi. 43), and declares that he will not come again until the gospel has been preached to all the nations of the earth (xxiv. 14), but he most expressly commissions the Apostles to admit into his Church all people without distinction by the simple act of baptism (xxviii. 19). So also the two accounts of the captain from Capernaum (viii. 5—10), of the woman of Canaan (xv. 21—28), where Jesus on the first occasion vouchsafes help without hesitation to the heathen man, and on the second only allows it to be extorted from him by the heathen woman after long refusal and only as an exceptional case—these two accounts, I say, are in direct contradiction to each other. Attempts have been made to reconcile this contradiction by assuming a development, a progress in the convictions of Jesus.* Something of this kind there may in reality have been, but it is not found in Matthew; if it had been, the account of the captain must have stood after that of the Canaanitish woman, and Jesus could not, after he had prophesied the calling of the heathen, have forbidden the Twelve to go the way to them. It is quite evident that we have here the distinction between two different periods and degrees of development of the most ancient Christianity; the speeches and narratives of one class are recorded at a time and from a point of view when the adoption of the heathen into the new Church of the Messiah was still delayed; those of the other are of a later period, when the spirit and the ministry of Paul had already

* Thus Keim in particular: *The Human Development of Jesus Christ*, p. 40 ff.

taken effect, and the mission to the heathen was considered as something that had existed in the mind of Jesus. And now we see at the same time how the most ancient Gospels were formed. From all sorts of short and imperfect records more comprehensive Gospels were compiled; but even these were not looked upon as finished, but were from time to time enriched by fresh interpolations and additions. But these portions did not always contain accounts of acts and words which had been really so done or spoken by Jesus, and up to that time preserved in oral tradition or some written record which had accidentally escaped the composer of the Gospel; but as time went on, a notion would arise, a tendency appear, which seemed an unavoidable consequence of the Christian principle. And then it was taken for granted as self-evident that Jesus must have said or done something pointing in that direction, and hence arose new narratives about Jesus, and speeches of his, which, at first brought forward in oral preaching, were afterwards introduced into the Gospels. "At every step forward," Schwegeler strikingly observes,* "which was made by the theological spirit, the Gospels also were corrected, what was obsolete or offensive was struck out, sometimes even many watchwords of the later generation were introduced, and thus we see the Church engaged in a continual production of evangelical speeches and sayings, till at last the Gospel reform attained its finality in the exclusive recognition of our synoptic Gospels and the establishment of the Catholic Church."

That the last of these finishing touches which the Gospel of Matthew underwent belongs to a rather late period, we may see from the so-called baptismal order (xxviii. 19), where the complete formula, "Baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," while in the Acts of the Apostles the baptism is simply in the name of Jesus, savours of the later ecclesiastical ritual. Individual corrections of this

* The Post-apostolic Age, i. 258 ff.

kind may have been introduced only into the Gospel of Matthew, as being that which was most used in the Church even after the two other synoptic Gospels were in existence. Thus in the account of the rich young man (xix. 16 ff.), the form of Jesus' answer in Mark (x. 17) and Luke (xviii. 18 ff.), "Why callest thou me good? none is good but one, God," is certainly the original; and in the form of the speech in Matthew, "Why askest thou me about the Good? One is the Good;"* the later alteration with reference to a Gnostic abuse of the passage, and the more elevated conception of Christ which the disclaimer of the predicate, good, appeared to contradict, is not to be mistaken.

Why this Gospel, which in all probability arose out of the traditions of the Galilean Christian churches, and was at a later period variously touched up and adapted to the progress of men's views within the Church, should be directly attributed to Matthew, might indeed be most easily explained on the supposition that he was at least the composer of the original and fundamental record. But that he was so is far from being proved by the notice of Papias, and the difficulty of explaining the circumstance without this supposition is not sufficient as an evidence for the correctness of it. The Gospel itself nowhere professes to be the work of Matthew. It is indeed the only one in which he appears particularly named out of the list of the Apostles, as it gives to the person called from the seat of custom, whom the two others call Levi, the name of Matthew (ix. 9). But he does not even here come anywhere prominently forward; on the contrary, it is everywhere Peter who in this Gospel, more than in any other, appears as chief of the Apostles. Meanwhile, since, according to several accounts from the Fathers of the Church, Matthew was considered as one of the preachers of the Gospel among

* The reference is here to a different reading from that in the Greek text of the Gospels as we have them. The different reading is, *τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός.*—*Translator.*

the Jews, and, besides this, as a former official of the customs might be considered as especially qualified for writing, the Gospel might be connected with his name even without his having actually taken part in the composition of it.

20. THE GOSPEL OF LUKE.

The Gospel of Luke has some of its contents in common with that of Matthew. Another scarcely less considerable part is peculiar to itself. Hand-in-hand with the other Gospel, though not without many discrepancies in arrangement, selection of matter and expression, it describes the public ministry of Jesus from the Baptism till the departure from Galilee; then, again, the occurrences in Jerusalem from the time of the entrance; in the history of the Infancy, it gives entirely different stories from that of Matthew, coinciding with the latter only in some fundamental assumptions; it prolongs in a manner peculiar to itself, and embellishes with matter for the most part its own, the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem: and again it tells much that is not told elsewhere in the history of the Passion, and still more in that of the Resurrection.

In the portions common to the two, Luke and Matthew coincide so completely even to the very words, that supposing the priority of the latter, Luke must have had before him either his fellow-evangelist, or the same sources as he had. Both even are possible; for among the numerous evangelical writings which, according to his preface, lay before Luke, there might very well have been, together with Matthew, one or other of the written originals, from which he took his Gospel. If he took his Sermon on the Mount from Matthew, it is difficult to explain why he changed the poor in spirit into the absolutely poor, those that hunger after righteous-

ness into those that really hunger ; still more difficult is it to explain how he came to put the condemnatory speech of Jesus against the people who slew the prophets (xi. 49) into the mouth of the "Wisdom of God," if he did not find these enigmatical words, which are wanting in Matthew (xxiii. 34), in the source used by him. Again, in recording the visit to Nazareth, Luke mentions the saying of Jesus, that they would expect him to do there as well the deeds which he had done at Capernaum (iv. 23). Now this expression, at the beginning of his ministry, where Luke puts the narrative, has no meaning. And Luke would certainly not have introduced it if he had not found it in the source from which he drew, which must consequently have placed this occurrence later, as the two other Synoptics do, but must have been a record different from theirs, in which that expression of Jesus is not found.

Otherwise the discrepancies between Luke and Matthew may be explained in part by the literary character of each. Luke, as a later writer, and, as is clear from the language of his preface, more educated in Greek, would give to his Gospel more liveliness, variety, and literary finish. This alone might determine him to break up the large groups of speeches in Matthew, and to provide the separate portions with introductions recounting the several occasions of them. In Matthew's history of the birth, the notion of a cloud which, though only for a moment, falls in the mind of Joseph upon the purity of Mary, might be offensive to him, and he might, therefore, prefer a representation of the facts which puts an end to all suspicion from the first. Adopting the method whereby he brings about at Bethlehem the birth of Jesus required by the prophecy, he might wish to play the learned man, and to display his knowledge of the taxing by Quirinus, which he also brings forward again in the Acts, v. 37. All this might be literary caprice, an endeavour to surpass his predecessors, to contrast his own work with theirs as one of a peculiar charac-

ter, and, if possible, superior, but still not properly a definite fundamental idea and purpose governing the historical representation given in his Gospel.

This, in the case of the professed companion of Paul, has been supposed to be the depreciation of the Jews, and the Twelve as Jewish Apostles, in contrast with the heathen and the Apostle of the heathen; in short, a Catholic tendency. And from this it has been thought possible to explain, for instance, his discrepancies from Matthew in the history of the Passion, when he represents Pilate as more merciful and just than his predecessor does, in order to throw the guilt of Jesus' death exclusively on the Jews. But in this case we have in Matthew, on the contrary, on the one hand in the traits peculiar to him of Pilate's washing his hands and the dream of his wife, such a manifest exoneration of the heathen from the guilt of Jesus' death, and on the other, in the feature which is found in Matthew only, the cry, that is, of the Jews that his blood should be upon their own and their children's heads, so solemn a transference of the guilt to the Jews, that at all events Luke, if endeavour he did to surpass Matthew in this point, has succeeded very ill.

Even the tendency to depreciate the Twelve is wrongly attributed to Luke in many places. It cannot, as Baur maintains, be proved that Jesus, on the occasion of the raising of Jairus' daughter, ejected at last the three Apostles whom he had taken with him (viii. 54); that on the occasion of the visit of his mother and his brethren he does not, as in Matthew, stretch out his hand over his disciples (viii. 21), appears by comparison with other passages (v. 9, x. 23) to be unimportant; in the explanation of the parable of the Sower in Luke, the words implying imputation on the Twelve (viii. 16 ff.) are not to be found, except by a forced interpretation.

The narrative of the visit of Jesus to Nazareth stands, in Matthew, who in this follows Mark, nearly in the middle of his Gospel, and of the Galilean ministry of Jesus (xiii. 53 ff.). By Luke, on the contrary, as has been already pointed out,

it is placed quite at the beginning of that ministry, immediately after the history of the Temptation. The immediate cause of this is nothing but a literary effort to suggest a motive for the choice by Jesus, not of Nazareth as his home, but of Capernaum; that motive being the bad reception which he had met with at the former place. If, however, we notice what emphasis is laid at the beginning of the narrative in Luke on the offer of salvation by the Messiah, and how at the end of it a heathen captain and a heathen widow are selected as examples of those to whom that salvation of which the Jews shewed themselves unworthy had spread, we cannot but think it extremely probable that in his modification of this history the Evangelist had at the same time a further object in view, and that that object was to represent the home of Jesus in its narrower sense only as the type of his home in a more extended meaning, the unbelief of the men of Nazareth as a precedent of that of the Jews in general, the migration of Jesus from Nazareth to Capernaum as an example of the transference of the Messianic blessings to the heathen, and that he considered this example so significant as to look upon it as a suitable one to stand as a signal at the very beginning of the ministry of Jesus.

Thus then we should have that Catholic Pauline tendency, the existence of which we might further be led to infer from two remarkable instances of connection between the Gospel of Luke and an Epistle of Paul. As regards the first, it is well known how, in the words of the institution of the Last Supper, Luke (xxii. 19 ff.), in opposition to Matthew and Mark, coincides with Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24 ff.), partly in the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," which are wanting in the other two, partly in the peculiar expression, "This is the new Testament in my blood," instead of which the two others have, "My blood of the new Testament,"—a coincidence which, as has already been remarked above, appears capable of explanation only on the supposition of the Evangelist's acquaintance with the Epistle of Paul. But there is

also another coincidence which leads us to conjecture that his relation to the writings of Paul was not one of mere acquaintance with them. This coincidence is connected with a narrative peculiar to Luke. He is the only one of the Apostles acquainted with the circumstance of Jesus having selected and commissioned, besides the twelve Apostles, seventy disciples; and if these seventy disciples have from the earliest period been rightly supposed to have a reference to the seventy nations of the world, as the twelve had to the twelve tribes of Israel, it can hardly be considered mere accident, but a sign that Luke himself considered the mission of the seventy as a type of the future mission to the heathen, when in the address which he attributes to Jesus before sending them forth, he makes him give word for word the same advice to them as to their sojourn in strange cities and houses as Paul gives to the Corinthian Christians in case they are invited to table by the heathen, namely, to eat all that is set before them (Luke x. 8; 1 Cor. x. 27).*

Connected with this is the other point, which is, that while in Matthew and Mark Jesus not only avoids Samaria, but also bids the Twelve avoid the cities of the Samaritans as well as the way of the heathen, in Luke he not only does not shrink himself from coming into contact with them on many occasions, but also in several speeches makes honourable mention of them: again, in Matthew, the centre of the ministry of Jesus is placed in Galilee, but in Luke is so divided between Galilee and the journey to Jerusalem (which in his Gospel passes partly through the district of Samaria), that a series of quite the most important sections both of doctrinal teaching and narrative, peculiar to himself, are transposed into this journey, as if it were not enough for him that Jesus, almost till the end of his life, should have been actively engaged in Galilee, and as if he wished by representing the

* 1 Cor.: *πᾶν τὸ παραπεσμένον ὑμῖν ἐσθίετε*. Luke: *ἐσθίετε τὰ παραπεσμένα ὑμῖν*.

entire absence in Jesus of prejudice against the Samaritans, who were placed on the same footing as the heathen, to break down the prejudices of the Jewish Christians of his time against the heathen. It is clear at once how in both respects the effort that we recognise in Luke is carried out to its completion in John,—the friendship for the Samaritans in the dialogue of Jesus with the Samaritan woman, and its consequences, the richer details of the one journey to Jerusalem, in the numerous journeys to the festivals.

From this point of view also, different omissions in Luke become significant. Some writers, indeed, in this respect have gone too far, and have taken too little account of accident and literary caprice; but when, for example, Peter, as the first in whom the knowledge of the Messiahship of Jesus arises, is blessed and named as the corner-stone of the Church, and Luke omits all this (ix. 20; comp. Matt. xvi. 17 ff.), he does so quite as little by accident as when he leaves out the history of the Canaanitish woman, where the declaration of Jesus that he was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and the severe comparison of the heathen to dogs, appeared to Paul's disciple to be inappropriate, if only from Jesus' condescension at the conclusion of the narrative. So also in the parable of the Tares in Matthew (xiii. 24 ff.), Luke might be offended by the description of the sower of tares by the same term (an enemy) as the Ebionites used to describe the Apostle Paul, and of the men compared with tares by the expression applicable to the Pauline Christians ("doers of iniquity"), which he elsewhere also avoids (xiii. 27, comp. with Matt. vii. 23),* and might, therefore, have omitted them.†

But in order thoroughly to understand the third Evangelist's mode of dealing with the material before him, we must

* The term in Luke is *ἀδικία*, in Matthew *ἀνομία*.

† Compare my treatise on the Parable of the Fruitful Field, in Hilgenfeld's *Journal of Scientific Theology*, 1863, p. 209 ff.

remember that his Gospel is only the first part of a work of which the Acts of the Apostles forms the second. After several preparatory labours, it has been lately proved to a certainty by Zeller's* thorough investigations, that this work was composed for the exaltation of the original Church in Jerusalem, and the Apostles who were the leaders of it; that it was touched up and completed with the object of so reconciling Pauline with Jewish Christianity, that on the one hand Paul should be placed on a footing of the same dignity with the first Apostles, and Peter in particular; and to represent Paul as more Petrine, and Peter more Pauline, than was actually the case; and that their relation to each other should be deprived of all opposition and hostility. From this there is every probability that in the first part also of his work the author pursued a similar course, not rejecting the most ancient Jewish tradition about Jesus, but only endeavouring in part to modify it in the spirit of Paul, in part to outweigh it by putting into the opposite scale portions taken from the writings of Paul. Thus the account of the Infancy in Luke, with the prominence given to John as the son of the Jewish priest, and the stress which it lays upon the fulfilment of the law of purification and circumcision in reference to the child Jesus, is not only generally very Jewish, but decidedly more Jewish than that of Matthew, which in the wise men from the East supplies an unmistakeable emblem of the coming of the heathen. But in the history of the Infancy in Luke, also, Jesus is described as a light to lighten the Gentiles, and moreover as a sorrow to his mother, consequently as the suffering Messiah (Luke ii. 32, 34 ff.), and by putting side by side with the days of Herod the king (i. 5), which was the customary date for the birth of Jesus (comp. Matt. iii. 1), the general taxing decreed by Augustus as emperor of the world; and, in contrast with the Jewish

* The Acts of the Apostles critically examined in reference to its Subject and Origin.

hymns of Mary and Zechariah, representing the angels after the birth of Jesus as proclaiming peace and goodwill to all mankind (ii. 14); and, moreover, by putting in the background the genealogy of Jesus, drawn up as it was in a Jewish spirit, and extending it to Adam and God the Father of all mankind (iii. 23—38): by all this he thought to satisfy both parties, leaving to the one what belonged to them, and giving to the other what they claimed.

Starting from this point, and going through the Gospel, we may, if we do not go too far in looking for a purpose, explain the composition of it throughout. The apparent contradictions vanish when we remember that it is in this that the peculiar method of the Evangelist consists, in allowing opposite opinions to have a hearing; that he did not, like the author of the fourth Gospel, feel himself to be the man to put the evangelical tradition into the crucible, and re-cast it all afresh, but was satisfied with bringing it into another shape by analysis, modification, and reformation. From this point of view let us examine, *e.g.*, the process he adopts with the Sermon on the Mount (vi. 20). It has already been mentioned that in the form in which it was found in Matthew it might, even in its literary character, appear to Luke to be too continuous, and have been divided by him even on this account alone. But its repeated and express connection with the Mosaic law—nay, its delivery from the mountain and consequent resemblance to a second law-giving from Sinai, might be too much for him; so those connecting points were set aside, the delivery from the mountain was transferred into the plain, and put later in point of time; but the introduction and conclusion, which especially mark it, were not meddled with, though the Evangelist, in reproducing the former, seems to have kept more to another source, which lay both before him and Matthew. He omitted, indeed, the declaration of Jesus (Matt. v. 17), that he had come, not for the destruction, but for the fulfilment of the law; but the saying, that heaven

and earth shall pass away before a jot or tittle of the law shall pass away—though the introduction of “the words of Jesus,” instead of “the law,” is said to have been a change made by Marcion—this saying he has, at all events, taken out of its connection with the Sermon on the Mount, and introduced it into a regular lumber-room of confused fragments of speeches, if not purposely wedged it in between two sentences which speak of the law—the one as obsolete, the other as capable of amendment (xvi. 17).^{*} In this very place, another sentence is produced with a remarkable alteration. In Matthew (xi. 12), Jesus says, “From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.” This enigmatical sentence admitted of an application to Paul; and therefore, perhaps, Luke gave it the turn, “Since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every one (as in the parable of the feast of the people from the by-ways and hedges, *i.e.* the heathen, Luke xiv. 23) presseth into it.” So also the sentence of the Sermon on the Mount about those who say, “Lord, Lord,” who in that day will appeal to their prophecies, their driving out of devils, and their doing of miracles in the name of Jesus, but will be rejected by him as doers of lawlessness, of whom he knows nothing (Matt. vii. 21—23), was probably coined by the Jewish-Christian author of the record against that Paulinism which was opposed to the law. But if we examine now how Jesus produces this saying in another connection (xiii. 26 ff.),—the Jews will on that day appeal to their having eaten and drunken in the presence of Jesus, and to his having taught in their streets, but notwithstanding shall be told by him to depart as doers (not indeed of lawlessness, but) of iniquity, and break out into loud weeping when they see people coming from the west and from the east, from the north and from the south, and sitting down at

^{*} Comp. G. d'Eichthal, *Les Evangiles*, ii. 230 ff.

table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but them themselves thrust out,—we may remark how skilfully Luke could turn a Jewish-Christian, anti-Pauline saying into one of a Pauline, anti-Jewish character.*

Proceeding thus, the author of the Gospel could deal with matter taken from a source of a still more decisively Judaizing character than Matthew. That he must have had such a source before him may be seen from what has been said above about the Beatitudes at the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount. Blessing the poor and the hungry merely as such, and representing them as heirs of future happiness, and, conversely, condemning the rich—this was the doctrine of the old Essenish Jewish Christians, who (as Luke iv. 6) set the devil as Master of the world in such strong opposition to Christ as the Master of the world to come, that they considered all participation in the good things of the devil's world as exclusion from the good things of the other; on the contrary, want and suffering in the first as the surest passport to blessedness in the last. Precisely the same view lies at the bottom of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus the poor man (Luke xvi. 19 ff.); but here we see at the same time how the Evangelist, by the addition of verse 27, though the parable is entirely framed on Ebionitish principles, could give it at the end a turn against the Jews, and their unbelief in the resurrection of Jesus. The more decisive opposition to Jesus, which in Luke is given to the devil, who, after the temptation, departs from him only for a season (iv. 13), at a later period passes into Judas, desires to sift the other disciples, and has power at the moment of the arrest of Jesus (xxii. 3, 31, 53), whom, however, Jesus saw fall from heaven like a flash of lightning (x. 10 ff.), and in particular in opposition to the devils shews his power over him—this strong opposition is indeed likewise Jewish, but might also have belonged

* Hilgenfeld (*Gospels*, p. 194) justly lays particular stress upon this passage for the understanding of the Gospel of Luke.

to the Evangelist's own conviction, as it contributes not a little to the elevation of Jesus into a superhuman character, and one even that inspires terror. This view of the impression made by the miracles of Jesus is repeatedly brought out by Luke (v. 8, 26, vii. 16, viii. 25, 37); and, in general, his idea of miracle is more material (viii. 45 ff.), and the miraculous narratives in him are drawn in brighter and more striking colours than in Matthew.

If the foregoing observations are correct, then Luke as compared with Matthew must be the later Evangelist; but that he is so may be proved also independently of what has been said above. When, in the introduction to the great final speech in Matthew (xxiv. 3), the question of the disciples to Jesus runs as follows: "When will this be done, and what is the sign of thy coming again, and of the end of the world?" they inquire into two points, the destruction of the Temple at Jerusalem, of which Jesus had just spoken, and the coming again of Christ for the closing of the present period of the world, both of which they conceive to be in immediate connection. Instead of this, Luke (xxi. 7) makes them ask tautologically, "When shall these things be, and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass?" (*i.e.* the destruction of the Temple, which he had just foretold), where, consequently, the point of the "coming again" is omitted—obviously because the author had been taught by the sequel that the destruction of the Temple and the coming again of Christ, together with the end of the world, were not so immediately connected as the author of the first Gospel had supposed. Conformable to this also is the mode in which the two Evangelists, in the following speech of Jesus, make the transition from the description of the one event to that of the other. In Matthew it is said (ver. 29), "Immediately after the tribulation of those days (of destruction) shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, . . . and then shall appear the sign of the

Son of Man in heaven;" he conceived therefore of the interval between the two events as only a short one. On the other hand, Luke, in the corresponding passage (v. 24 ff.), has not only rejected the word "immediately," but also put into the mouth of Jesus the prophecy that Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled; he had therefore seen a longer time pass away since the destruction than the author of Matthew's Gospel had done; he must consequently have written his Gospel considerably later, though previously to the insurrection of the Jews under Hadrian, of which, otherwise, some trace would have been found in his description.

Since, accordingly, the Gospel belongs to a period in which it is scarcely possible that there could be any companion of Paul alive and composing books, the question arises how it came to be ascribed to an author of this description in the person of Luke. The cause of this lay in the Acts of the Apostles; for in the second division of his work the narrator appears in certain passages as a companion of Paul (xvi. 10—17, xx. 5—15, xxi. 1—18, xxvii. 1—28). As this companionship goes on to Rome, and in the Epistles of Paul professedly written from his Romish prison, Luke also, among others, appears as his confidential friend (Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Philem. 24), it has been assumed that Luke was that companion, and that this companion was at the same time the author of the two works, the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles. But if the first of these two assumptions, even independent of the more than doubtful authenticity of the Epistles of Paul from the prison, is arbitrary, because, as has been stated, Luke is by no means the only one who appears in them as belonging to Paul's set, the other assumption rests upon the false conclusion that the narrator, who in some passages of the Acts comprises himself and the Apostle under the word "we," must at the same time be the author of the whole work. But this does not

follow, even as regards the second part of it, the Acts of the Apostles; on the contrary, if the speaker in these passages were at the same time the composer of the whole work, he could hardly have helped giving us information as to where he comes from and where he goes to on every occasion. The extraordinary appearance and disappearance again of the word "we," is to be explained only on the supposition that the later compiler worked up into his narrative passages from the memoranda of a companion of Paul, whose name we do not know, and that he did so, indeed, not in a very skilful manner. As regards the locality in which the work was composed, the concluding words of the Acts of the Apostles, professing as they do to be written in Rome, as well as the tendency to reconcile the differences between the Jewish-Christian and Pauline spirit in the unity of the Church, appear to point to that capital of the world quite as much as the full description of Paul's missionary activity in Asia Minor to Asia; in any case, we are referred to a locality out of Palestine, and a circle that had outgrown a narrow-minded Jewish Christianity.

21. THE GOSPEL OF MARK.

One of the most difficult questions of New Testament criticism is that as to the proper place of the Gospel of Mark; and the consequence has been that there is no place which has not been lately assigned to it, and more than once.* We do not think that we need notice here the theory which

* As to this Gospel in particular, comp. Hilgenfeld, *The Gospel of Mark* (1850); Baur, *The Gospel of Mark* (1850); Hilgenfeld, *New Examination of the Gospel of Mark*, *Theologic. Annual*, 1852, p. 108 ff., 259 ff.; Baur, *Review of the latest Examinations of the Gospel of Mark*, *Theologic. Annual*, 1853, p. 54 ff.

considers it to be the original Gospel, since by the admissions of its champions that in our present Mark we have no longer this original Gospel in its original form, but interpolated in many ways, and besides this abbreviated, it destroys itself, and we must leave the recognition of the "scent of the fresh flowers" to the same judge of genius who in the Venerable F. Chr. Baur has found the C. F. Bahrdt of the nineteenth century in the acute logician Reimar, a man of confused brain. Schwegler* appears to us to have come nearer the mark when he calls the text of Mark, in comparison with that of Matthew, a flat and pointless performance, with no character at all; and Köstlin,† when he says that the second Gospel belongs to a late stage of evangelical historic writing, and stands in the same relation to the first in particular as that in which, in all literatures, those productions that are prosaic in their original conception, but which for that very reason hanker in details after striking expressions and flowery description, stand to the classical productions of more ancient time.

Even Schleiermacher‡ drew attention to the mode in which this Evangelist displays an effort, with something far-fetched in it, to attain vividness and a sensuous picturesqueness in his narrative. With this, he remarks, is connected a certain exaggeration in description here and there bordering on the unnatural, an introduction of mental emotions without any cause for them, a scheming for people to flock together without our knowing where they come from; an endeavour, again, to give things a mysterious look, to which, beside the taking of the sick apart, Schleiermacher refers also the manipulations of them, and the application of material means in the miraculous cures of Jesus, which might be construed, only incor-

* Hypothesis of the creative original Evangelist, in Zeller's *Theological Annals*, 1843, p. 217.

† *Origin and Composition of the Synoptic Gospels*, p. 323.

‡ *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 313.

rectly, in favour of the natural explanation. This attempt at picturesqueness, but with insufficient means, this effort at exaggeration and artistic beauty, Schleiermacher considered as a sign that the Gospel of Mark has been more touched up than the two other synoptic Gospels; nay, with reference to this, he ascribed to it, though only in point of form, an approximation to the apocryphal character.

Every unprejudiced reader of Mark will be compelled to corroborate these remarks, and to add to them some of his own. The character of the later writer shews itself also in the attempt to give a motive for what, in his predecessors, is simply told; and in doing this Mark is often mistaken, as in giving a reason for the unfruitfulness of the fig-tree (xi. 13), or in the case of the foolish speech of Peter at the transfiguration (ix. 6). It is also the pedantry of a later age when he endeavours, as he sometimes does, to make the miracles, as the withering of the fig-tree, the healing of the blind man at Bethesda (viii. 24 ff.), more picturesque, by representing them as something *successive*, whereas a miracle, as a proof of the power of God working by the mere word, must be conceived as something sudden, and is always so represented in the earlier narrative of miracle. In what a meagre and sorry way does Mark endeavour to limit and reduce many a bold expression of the older Evangelist. In Matthew, Jesus forbid his disciples to take with them on their missionary journey wallet, staff and shoes. To Mark the staff appeared indispensable, and instead of the shoes he allows at least sandals (vi. 8 ff.). Matthew makes the disciples, on their passage over the sea, forget, on one occasion, to take bread with them. This amount of thoughtlessness is too much for him, and he makes them have at least one loaf, but nothing more, in the ship (viii. 14). Conversely, the single crowing of the cock, compared with Peter's triple denial, was too little for him, and he invents a double one (xiv. 72).

By all this Mark betrays himself, generally, as a writer of a late period. Still it is far easier to prove that Matthew was before him than that Luke also was of an earlier date: Matthew, for instance, describes the offence taken by the Pharisees at the omission of the washing of hands on the part of the disciples of Jesus without further preface (xv. 1 ff.); Mark, on the contrary (vii. 1 ff.), finds it necessary to premise a lengthy discussion about the customs of the Jews in this respect. And every one will say that the latter course, considering especially the dry, antiquarian manner in which the thing is done, points to a later date. Or if we choose to say, avoiding the inference, that it only points to a locality for the composition of the Gospel at a distance from Palestine, let us take passages like Mark ix. 1, and compare them with Matthew xvi. 28. In this place, why does Mark (and Luke, too, nearly the same, ix. 27) make Jesus say, not, as Matthew does, that there are some among these standing here who will not taste of death until they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom; but only, till they see the kingdom of God coming with power? Obviously because the generation of Jesus' contemporaries had died out, and while his kingdom had come in the spread and establishment of the Christian Church, he himself had not come in person. And why does Mark, and he alone, make Jesus conclude his exhortation to the disciples to be watchful as they know not at what moment he will come, with the words, "What I say to you I say to all, Watch!" (xiii. 37), except to preserve the effect of that exhortation, which, if it was confined to the disciples, appeared pointless, as none of them had lived to see the coming again of Christ, by extending it to all Christians living at that time and later.

Finally, when we read in the great final speech in Matthew (xxiv. 20), "But pray that your flight may not be in winter or on the Sabbath day," and find the last words left out in Mark (xiii. 18), we see plainly that in the interval between

the composition of the first and second Gospel the Sabbath had lost its importance in the Christian Church.

As regards the relation of Mark's Gospel to Luke, it might seem the easiest way of explaining the circumstance that nearly all the portions are wanting in Mark which are peculiar to Luke as distinguished from Matthew, to assume that Mark on his part had only Matthew before him, and knew nothing of the rich additions which Luke was the first to make. For no reason can be imagined for his setting them aside if he had them before him. But, on the one hand, some of the matter which Luke only has, and not Matthew, is found in Mark, and, on the other hand, he has also omitted much of that, in Matthew, which was before him; if he had his reasons for doing this, we may suppose that he also had them for leaving still more, in Luke, untouched.

If we look for more definite proofs, the decisive question is this, whether passages are found in which the relation between Mark and Luke can only be explained on the supposition that the first made use of the last, while on the converse assumption it cannot be so explained. Thus, looking to the way in which Mark gives the account of the Temptation (i. 13), most persons will surely admit that an account so confused and unintelligible in itself can only be explained by supposing the author to have glanced at a longer one, which he hastily abbreviated, adding, however, the strange feature about the beasts. This only as an example of the relation in which two accounts must stand to each other for the purposes of the proof to be brought forward; for here that used by Mark, as the ministration by angels at the end shews, was obviously that of Matthew. But Mark and Luke stand to each other in a relation exactly corresponding to this in the history of the Resurrection. Mark says (xvi. 12): "After that he appeared in another form unto two of them as they walked and went into the country;" no one will mistake the story of the disciples going to Emmaus, in Luke

(xxiv. 13 ff.), and scarcely any one will fail to see that a notice so short and unmeaning could not have been given at all except with reference to the long and important account in Luke. The case is the same with the concluding promise of Jesus (xvi. 17), where narratives out of the Acts of the Apostles, especially chap. ii. 28, 3 ff., appear to be supposed; but as these examples are taken from a section of the Gospel of Mark, the authenticity of which is under discussion, they are insufficient as proofs.

But there are several cases in which, in the language of Mark, sometimes a reference to Luke alone, sometimes to Matthew and Luke together, appears to betray itself. Mark begins his list of the Apostles (iii. 14 ff.) thus: "And he ordained twelve that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out devils; and Simon he surnamed Peter; and James the son of Zebedee and John the brother of James." Now these accusatives are not so easily explained by the government of the remote tenses, "he ordained" and "might send forth," as upon the supposition of a reference to a source giving all the names of the Apostles from the first in the accusative, and this the list in Luke does (vi. 14 ff.). In other cases the expression in Mark appears to be compounded of the words of the two other Synoptics. Thus Matthew (iii. 11) makes the Baptist say, "He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear." In Luke (iii. 16) he says, "One mightier than I cometh (but not, after me), the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose." Now, in Mark, when we read (i. 7), "There cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose," we see that he gets from Luke the form of expression, "One mightier than I cometh;" from Matthew, "after me;" he has taken the unloosing of the shoe-latchet again from Luke, instead of the "bearing of the shoes," and added the "bend-

ing down" as an ornamental piece of painting of his own. So in another place in Matthew (xiv. 1 ff.), Herod pronounces Jesus to be the Baptist risen again, and thence derives the miraculous powers possessed by him, but nothing is said of the opinion of the people. In Luke (ix. 7 ff.) conversely it is the people who entertain this opinion, and other opinions as well; Herod only says that he beheaded John, and "who then is this of whom he hears such things?" consequently expresses no definite opinion about him. But Mark (vi. 14 ff.), exactly like Matthew, first makes Herod say of himself, that this is the Baptist risen again, and therefore these powers are working in him; then, exactly as in Luke, the different conjectures of the people are brought forward, and Herod bethinks himself of the beheading of the Baptist, but not, as in Luke, to attach a question to his recollection, but to pronounce decidedly that it is the Baptist risen again from the dead, as he had already done in Mark (as in Matthew) at the very beginning; and the repetition, consequently, in Mark's narrative, becomes perfectly unmeaning. Here Mark would not have begun in this way if he had not had Matthew before him, not have continued as he does if he had not had Luke, nor ended as he does if he had not again had Matthew. A similar coincidence of expression will be found on the occasion of the "even" (i. 32), of the healing of the leper (i. 42), and in many other places. On the other hand, in the introduction to the history of the Temptation in Luke (iv. 1 ff.), the connection of a forty days' duration of the Temptation, with the three separate acts of it that come in afterwards, is brought forward, indeed, as a proof of a double dependence of the third Gospel upon the first and second. But the uncertainty as to the reading and construction makes this very doubtful.

Finally, we have a series of small additions, of which the sole object is to give a more lively colouring to the description, as "stooping" (i. 7); "and he looked round about on

them" (iii. 34, x. 23); "when he had looked round about on them with anger" (iii. 5); "beholding him, loved him" (x. 21); "he sighed" (vii. 34); "moved with compassion" (i. 41); "taking him in his arms" (ix. 36, x. 16); and the like, additions which are wanting in the two other Synoptics. Now if it is asked which is the more probable, that not only Matthew, but also Luke, in so far as he has the corresponding narratives, found these features in Mark, but avoided recording them, or that Mark laid them as pretty colours on his own description, an unprejudiced person will certainly decide in favour of the latter supposition.

We may ask what object Mark can have had in his work if, as must be most probable, he thus compiled his Gospel out of the two others? In the first place, it is evident that one object was abbreviation, or an attempt to execute a work of smaller extent than the two other Gospels. There was also a further one. The differences between Matthew and Luke, says Gfrörer,* not unreasonably, were extremely inconvenient, especially as both Gospels were used in the Church. Hence a Christian hit upon the notion of uniting in a third taken from the other two what seemed to him to be essential in both. Then, if we consider in what circles of the Church the reading of Matthew might be preferred, and in which that of Luke, the object of Mark becomes more accurately defined as being that of publishing a Gospel which should satisfy both parties, Jewish as well as Gentile Christians. Possibly the tendency of the second Gospel may thus appear to coincide with that of the third. But on closer consideration there is this distinction, that Mark endeavours, by avoidance and omission, to effect what Luke did more by addition and contrast. So that the distinction, again, between the objects of the two might be described by saying that Luke proposed to himself to open a door for the admission

* *The Sacred Legend*, ii. 124.

of Pauline ideas without offending Gentile Christianity, Mark, on the contrary, in a negative spirit, to publish a Gospel which could not hurt the feelings of either party. Hence he avoids every extreme that was likely to serve as a scandal or a watchword to one party or the other; he avoids all those disputed questions which disturbed the Church up to the middle of the second century. Without doubt this is his reason for omitting the account of the birth and infancy of Jesus. There was the genealogy, upon which the Jewish Christians of the old stamp prided themselves so much, while certain parties among them, as we see from the Homilies of Clement, from dislike for David, the hero of war and love, were offended with it, and the Gentile Christians had no interest in it. There was the account of the supernatural begetting of Jesus, which might be agreeable to the Gentile Christians, but which was disputed by a section of the Jewish Christians, as well as by the old Gnostics, Cerinthus and Carpocrates; there was the narrative of the Eastern astrologers, and the flight of the infant Messiah into Egypt, the land of idols and magic, at which offence might likewise be taken. And when Marcion went still further on the other side, and struck out of his Gospel the section about John the Baptist, the baptism and temptation of Jesus, it looks as if our Evangelist had wished to enter upon the neutral ground, omitting as he did the history of the infancy, and planting his boundary-stone before the section about the baptism, with the words (i. 1), "The (proper) beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."

We may look at the question now as a balance of accounts in which the equal sums are struck out on both sides. Everywhere, when a Judaizing feature is left out, a Catholic one is given up too. Thus, on the one side, Mark sacrifices to the feelings of the Gentile Christians the asseveration of Jesus about the uninterrupted duration of the law, his command to the disciples not to turn to the Gentiles and

Samaritans, the promise that they shall one day sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, the blessing and exaltation of Peter; but likewise, in order to spare the Jewish Christians, he has set aside the severe words in the speech of the Baptist (i. 74), that God could raise up children to Abraham from stones; in the parable of the Husbandmen of the Vineyard (xii. 9), the express application to the Jews, from whom the kingdom of God shall be taken; then, on account of its concluding turn, which threatens at the same time the exclusion of the Jews and calling in of the Gentiles, the whole history (Matt. viii. 12) about the Captain of Capernaum; the long account, moreover, of the journey given in Luke, with its Paulinizing sections, as the parable of the Prodigal Son, the stories of the good and the grateful Samaritans. On one occasion we see him change characters with Luke, as was very natural when their objects were so similar. Luke, who generally understands how to get out of a difficulty by modifying or transposing a story, prefers entirely to omit the account of the Canaanitish woman, by reason of the declaration of Jesus that he was not sent but to the house of Israel, as well as by reason of the comparison of the Gentiles to dogs. Mark endeavours to preserve the narrative by striking out the declaration of Jesus, and introducing before the passage about the dogs, the palliating words that the children should at all events be allowed to satisfy themselves before giving to them, *i.e.* that the Jews should be invited to the salvation of the Messiah; that before everything possible has been done for this, it is wrong to give to the dogs, *i.e.* to admit Gentiles into the kingdom of the Messiah. The Evangelist might think that account had been taken long enough of the right of precedence of the Jews, and that therefore the admission of the Gentiles could, from that time, be properly delayed no longer.

Connected with this object of abbreviation, and the tendency to omit everything admitting of dispute, is the cir-

cumstance that Mark either leaves out all long speeches, like the Sermon on the Mount, or shortens them very much, as, for instance, the instructions to the disciples, the speeches against the Pharisees, and that about the last day, since in these speeches, as in the Sermon on the Mount in particular, these questions of principle are brought forward with which the party disputes were engaged. In this we may recognise still more the mark of a later period, to which, in reference to Jesus, the history, understood chiefly as a miraculous history, had become more important than the doctrine. At first, after people had begun generally to reflect upon particular parts of the life and ministry of Jesus, his frequent speeches were considered as the most important things. We may see this even from the mode in which, as stated above, Papias used the expression, "Sayings of the Lord," to describe an evangelical writing. Thus in Matthew the speech-element is the most important part of his history; even in Luke, however much he may be continually endeavouring by subdivision of the larger groups of speeches to establish a sort of balance between speeches and actions, the relation between the two is still, on the whole, unchanged; Mark, by the way in which he shortens the longer speeches, and lengthens the narratives, especially the miraculous, by fresh colouring, is the first to shew that with him the latter were of more importance than the former. In the latest of our Gospels, that of John, the overweight is again on the side of the speech-element. But the cause of this lies in the introduction of a new dogmatic point of view, which had to be explained in connected doctrinal speeches. On the contrary, shorter sayings in connection with the appearance of Jesus as a doer of miracles were sufficient for Mark's object. While therefore he insists upon the impression made by Jesus in this character, as well upon the people as upon the disciples, at least as strongly as Luke does, he makes the miraculous narratives even still more striking than Luke,

by his favourite practice of recounting the miraculous words of Jesus, like those of a magic formula, in the Aramaic original (v. 41, vii. 34)* and he also gives an account of two miraculous cures, neither of which is found in the others; while both have the feature in common that Jesus takes the sick man apart from the people and applies spittle (vii. 31 ff., viii. 22 ff.).

If we inquire as to the sources of these and some other features peculiar to Mark, it is possible that the two accounts of the cures may have been spun by him out of Matthew (ix. 32, xii. 32), and coloured up according to his own ideas of miracles. Elsewhere he has all sorts of names and persons peculiar to himself, as the surname of the two sons of Zebedee, already often mentioned, the father's name of Levi the publican, of the blind man at Jericho, the names and father's names together, the names of both the sons of Simon of Cyrene; lastly, on the occasion of the arrest of Jesus, the notice of the young man who fled away naked. Nothing can be determined for certain as to whether he owes these features to one or more written sources, whether to oral tradition, or only to his own combination and imagination; sometimes one of these may be the case, sometimes another.

We must not, however, entirely overlook the relation in which the Gospel of Mark appears to stand to that of John. From the nature of the case, the two other Synoptics have certain points of contact with this Gospel, partly in narratives, partly in particular utterances of Jesus; but it is between Mark and John that in some places the coincidence is so close, that a proof has been found in them of the dependence of one upon the other, possibly, from an apologetic point of view, of Mark upon John. If we collect all the passages together which come under consideration here, it is certainly

* It appears to be a great misunderstanding on the part of Renan, to look upon this as a sign of originality. In this point also Eichthal is more correct, *Les Evangiles*, i. 67 note.

in a high degree probable that one had the other before him, but which had which, is a question which will never be decided but upon the general conception which any one may have formed as to the origin and natural relation of the two Gospels. In the narrative of the man sick of the palsy, in Mark (ii. 9, 12), and of the sick man at the pool of Bethesda, in John (v. 9), we find, under circumstances entirely different, the address of Jesus: "Arise, take up thy bed and walk," agreeing in these two Gospels even to the word, not a very common one, with which the bed is described; but which of the two accounts here is to be considered the earlier one, unless we are to suppose the remarkable speech to have been preserved in the tradition, cannot be seen from the words themselves. In the history of the Feeding, Mark (vi. 37) and John (vi. 7), and only they, have the 200 pence; and likewise in the account of the anointing at Bethany, only they have the 300 pence in common, which in the first case must have been spent for sufficient food, in the latter might have been got for the ointment; in addition to which, in the last story, the coincidence of the same two Evangelists appears in a peculiar construction, and in a word which is so rare that a dispute among the interpreters was possible as to whether it means "genuine" or "potable" (Mark xiv. 3, 5; John xii. 3, 5).^{*} Here, in reference to the first coincidence, attention has been drawn to the exaggeration which states that the 200 pence said in Mark to be sufficient for the provision of sufficient food, are declared in John to be insufficient for every one to have even a morsel of bread, and in this exaggeration an indication has been discovered that the account of John is the later one. But this supposition is again destroyed by the fact that, in the case of the other story, the exact converse is the case; for Mark, not satisfied with the 300 pence at which John values the ointment, esti-

^{*} Mark, Ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς. John, Λίτραν μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου.

mates it as saleable at a still higher price. In the history of the Passion, there are some other resemblances of less importance, but in that of the Resurrection, Mark and John coincide in the feature of Jesus appearing first, not as in Matthew to Mary Magdalen and the other Mary, but to the former alone (Mark xvi. 9; John xx. 11 ff.). And if we were to weigh the matter in the same scales as the case of the story of the two disciples going into the country, we might say that the short notice in Mark looks as if it might be taken only as an abbreviation of the full narrative in John. There is indeed this difference, that a story relating to a person so well known as Magdalen, however shortly told, was always of some importance, while, on the contrary, what happened to two nameless disciples (for such they are in Mark) only gained importance by the more definite circumstances of which Mark does indeed give an indication, but which is not intelligible in itself without a glance at the longer narrative. But these two cases belong to the conclusion of Mark's Gospel, the absence of which in several old MSS. makes it suspected on critical grounds.

How it happened that our Gospel was headed with the name of Mark, who appears in the Acts of the Apostles (xii. 12) as the son of a mother on friendly terms with Peter, and who belonged to the first Christian Church in Jerusalem, at a later period as the companion of Paul and Barnabas for a considerable time (xii. 25, xv. 37 ff.), then in the first Epistle of Peter as in the set of this Apostle, probably at Rome, and mentioned in the tradition of the Church as his interpreter, may, after all that has been said, be easily explained. Among the Evangelists, Paul was represented by his friend Luke; consequently Peter could not be left without a similar representative; and the selection of Mark for this purpose was probably made with a view to the neutral character of the Gospel, for the composer of which a man who had been intimate with Paul and Peter in succession

seemed to be especially suitable. But as the reconciliation of parties, the peaceful combination of the two great Apostles' names, could only be brought about by Peter being ranked above Paul, so also in the Canon the follower of Paul was obliged to give the precedence to the follower of Peter, and the Gospel of Mark was placed before that of Luke as the second before the third. The supposition that it was in the city in which this reconciliation of the contending parties, this combination of the two Apostles' names, was completed for the foundation of the Catholic Church, or at all events in the Roman West, that the Gospel of Mark first saw the light, is further corroborated by the Latinisms which appear in his Greek more frequently than in any other writing of the New Testament.

22. COMPARATIVE ESTIMATE OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

If we now ask, at the conclusion of these introductory investigations into the Gospels, what each of them contributes to the historical knowledge of Jesus, his personality, his plan and destiny, the preponderance falls, according to all that has been said hitherto, on the side of Matthew. We have every reason for supposing that of all the Gospels this is the one which brings before our eyes, in its earliest form, the figure of Christ as it lived in the most ancient Church.

Not that it is the most ancient of the writings of the New Testament. Undoubtedly the genuine Epistles of Paul are in every case more ancient. But Paul had scarcely known Jesus even by sight; and when we read how he regularly gave himself some credit for not having in the least made haste after his miraculous call, but let three whole years pass by before seeking the acquaintance of the older Apostles (Gal. i. 17), from whom alone he could expect more accurate

information about the life of Jesus, we see how little he cared for this, how, in comparison with the Christ that had arisen in him, the Christ of the older Apostles, *i.e.* the historical Christ in comparison with his own idea of Christ, was in his opinion of subordinate importance. Of the particulars of the life of Jesus, there are only the well-known facts of his crucifixion and resurrection, and besides these the institution of the Last Supper, that we find brought forward in the Epistles of Paul, as having reached him by tradition (1 Cor. ii. 32 ff., xv. 3 ff.). Even the Revelation of John is older than the Gospel of Matthew, but from it we see plainly how the eyes of the most ancient Christian Church had a tendency to look in a direction altogether opposite to a retrospect upon the earthly walk of Jesus. The less he had answered, during his earthly life so violently ended, to those national expectations which even his ablest disciples could not entirely give up, so much the more impatiently did all hearts beat for his second advent, supposed to be so near, which was to be the brilliant counterfoil to his human existence that had passed away, which was to introduce, in rich abundance, all that had been wanting to the latter. Therefore, even in the Apocalypse, but little is said of the death and resurrection of Jesus as involving the fundamental ideas of Christianity, while the glowing imagination of prophecy is entirely turned towards the expected future. It was necessary for these expectations of the future, to a certain extent, to cool, for the return of the Departed to be for some time delayed, before men felt inclined to turn backwards for a while, and to look for the traces of his higher dignity in what had passed away as a guarantee for that which was to come.

Thus it was fortunate that at the time when literary activity, turning away from the tendency to look at the present in Epistles and to the future in Revelations, applied itself to the past in the life of Jesus, and the description of it in Gospels, there was current in the regions in which he had

ministered a rich supply of his memorable speeches and sayings, in part indeed separated from the original occasions which gave rise to them, and broken up in their internal connection, in some cases also modified according to the circumstances of a later age, but still such that they bore upon the face of them the genuine stamp of the spirit of Jesus. It was different with the circumstances of his life; of these circumstances, when the impulse to evangelical literature arose, manifestly only the most general outlines were remembered, and these it was of so much the more importance to fill up and embellish out of the imaginary conception formed of him who was expected to come with the clouds of heaven. Hence the number of miraculous accounts, which are only, as it were, the cooling lava from the Apocalyptic crater; hence those brilliant points, like the scenes of the Baptism, of the Transfiguration, of the Resurrection of Jesus, in which the future glory of him who was expected from heaven was supposed to have shone through the humble covering of his earthly life.

All this appears in Matthew in special originality, which however, as appears from all that has been said, is only relative. For even in this Gospel we have a medium dimmed by distance of time and all sorts of intermediate ideas and events, in which much may have been lost, many an important word, many an act of Jesus may have fallen into oblivion; on the other hand, much may have been added to the type of Jesus, many a word that he never spoke, many an act which he never did, many an event which never occurred to him, and likewise much in the Gospel may appear in an altered light, in smeared colouring. At all events, we know from history what a thick stratum of Jewish prejudices prevented a pure apprehension of the idea of the Messiah even by the most distinguished of his disciples, and that this obstacle was by no means removed with the removal of the Master. And thus it is obvious to suppose that it was perhaps precisely our

oldest Gospel upon which these prejudices took effect. We have therefore to take away many a Jewish feature from the figure of Christ as given by him, and place them to the account of the medium through which, in the Gospel, we see that figure.

Hence the possibility that with all the relative preference given to the first Gospel, the subsequent ones also may have the advantage over it in some particulars. In the first place, they might supply much that is not found in the first Gospel, either because it was wanting in the circle of tradition from which this was taken, but was preserved in other circles, or because it was passed over by the compilers purposely or accidentally. Such a supplement is given us by Luke, and we are by no means justified in rejecting as unhistorical what he thus supplies, simply because it is not in Matthew, but we shall find our knowledge of Jesus enriched from many speeches peculiar to Luke in particular. Even in his Acts of the Apostles (xx. 35), Luke contributes an utterance of Jesus which he had forgotten in the Gospel, "To give is better than to receive," of which at least we must say that it is entirely worthy of Jesus and quite in his spirit. Nay, of the sayings preserved only by the apocryphal Gospels, some might be genuine, as for example that so often quoted by the Fathers of the Church, "Be shrewd dealers."* It is indeed not impossible, but on the contrary, according to the foregoing discussion, might *a priori* be supposed, that many sayings and many accounts of Jesus may have spontaneously arisen in the legend, or have been intentionally invented to serve as a support for certain ideas and purposes; as is probable, for instance, in the case of the selection and mission of the seventy disciples, or the modification which the history of the resurrection in Luke as compared with Mark has under-

* *Γίνεσθε τραπέζιται δόκιμοι*. Quoted in the Homilies of Clement, ii. 51, iii. 50, xviii. 20; by Clement of Alexandria, Strom. i. 28; also by Origen, Hieronymus, and others. Perhaps the saying belonged to the parable of the Talents, as given in the Hebrew Gospel; s. Hilgenfeld, Gospel of the Hebrews, Journal of Scientific Theology, 1863, p. 368.

gone, and in particular in the case of the conclusion of this, the history of the Ascension, which appears to have grown up in the interval which elapsed between the composition of the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles.

The same twofold possibility exists in those cases in which a speech or an event detailed by Matthew is wanting in the other Evangelists. There is then less probability against the historical truth of the account in the first Gospel than in the converse case, as Mark, even for the sake of brevity, must have left out much, and he, as well as Luke, may have passed over other matter solely on dogmatical grounds. But when these dogmatical suspicions were directed against narratives which only owed their own existence to dogmatic prejudice, they might, if only accidentally, lead to the removal of unhistorical features from the type of Jesus. Thus Luke and Mark undoubtedly did right when they omitted from the instructions to the Twelve the command not to turn to the Gentiles and Samaritans, as this prohibition in the account of the first Gospel had probably only proceeded from the notions of prejudiced Jewish Christians.

As regards the Gospel of John, the conclusion of modern criticism is to the effect that the famous enrichment which it brings to the evangelical history is only apparent and not real, that all that it contains of a really historical character is taken from the older Gospels, and that all that goes beyond this is either pure invention or modification. From this conclusion but little abatement is likely to be made; but it is another question whether we may not recognise something, in the point of view from which the Gospel contemplates its Christ, that may be a correction of the productions of the older Evangelists. The freer tone of spiritual thought in the fourth Gospel is indeed represented in a manner which was certainly foreign to Jesus; but have we not examples of cases in which, *e.g.*, a philosopher of a later age has attained to the correct understanding of a poem or a religion by the

interposition of ideas of which the poet or the founder of the religion himself knew nothing? If we suppose, what has not only historical analogy in its favour, but in this case is clear from definite traces, that the first disciples of Jesus did not fully understand him, that the standpoint of the first Church remained behind his own, and that our older Evangelists, especially Matthew, are also upon the standpoint of the most ancient Church, then the fourth may have mounted to his more elevated position by means of a ladder borrowed from Alexandria, and so he might by means of this foreign ladder have come nearer to Jesus' own standpoint; and if we lay down the speech in Matthew about the indestructibility of even the smallest letter of the law, and that in John about the worshipping of God in spirit and in truth, as the two most opposite extremes, it is very doubtful to which of these two points we are to suppose the historical Jesus to have come the nearest.

But we must be on our guard, after having overcome the prejudice which supposes an entire coincidence between the Gospel of John and the others, against widening the gap too much between the two sides in reference to spirit and standpoint: when Baur calls the Gospel of John the most spiritual, but also the most unhistorical of all the Gospels,* the latter predicate does not suffer any real limitation from the above discussion. But when he defines the former more accurately to the effect, that it is the sphere of pure spirituality into which this Gospel transports us,† there is in this statement much that is incorrect. Even Baur does not understand it very literally, for he points, in the Gospel, to a series of features which are anything but purely spiritual. But he does not combine these features, as he does the opposite ones, into the unity of a collective idea, as his whole

* Introduction to the New Testament as Science: Theologic. Annual, 1851, p. 306.

† Christianity of the Three First Centuries, p. 170.

essay is rather directed to pointing out the spiritual side of the Gospel of John, in doing which he is continually tempted to overlook the other side. But this remarkable Gospel can only be perfectly understood by observing that as on the one hand it is the most spiritual, so on the other it is the most material of all. Its author starts with understanding miracle symbolically and stripping away from it all that is material, with conceiving of the first and second Advent of Christ as a coming in the spirit, of the Resurrection and the Judgment as something being now continually consummated; but he stops half-way, relapses into the material miracle, which he then exalts as much materially as he makes it more important spiritually; he places the material re-appearance of Jesus, with the marks of his wounds, side by side with the spiritual second advent in the Paraclete, the future external judgment side by side with the internal judgment already present; and his mystical character consists in doing both at once—in having and contemplating the one in the other. So little, as we saw above, have some of the moderns been able to conceive a combination of these two sides in the Gospel of John, that on account of their supposed irreconcilability they have thought it right to distinguish between those component parts of it in which they seemed to recognise the spiritual standpoint, and those that bear the more material stamp, as apostolic and non-apostolic, shewing by this attempt that the real nature of the Johannine Gospel has remained unintelligible to them. And yet they had an instructive analogy in their immediate neighbourhood. The Book of Wisdom, which belongs to the Alexandrian Judaism, whose expositions on the subject of the Wisdom that arranges and governs the world, and the omnipotent word of God, should be on their own account compared for the understanding of the Johannine Gospel, shews us on one side a very spiritual and decided philosophical standpoint, accompanied, however, with so fantastic a belief in miracles, that, for in-

stance, the plagues of Egypt are embellished with the wildest wonders of which the narrative in Exodus knows nothing. There is a similar contradiction in Philo, not to be overlooked. Platonism also had it; every system of philosophy in the present day has it, that works through the imagination, putting the critical understanding in the background; and exactly similar instances may be brought forward from the history of the Schellingian philosophy and also of the old Hegelian school.

And it is exactly in this character of the Gospel of John that the cause is found which makes it the favourite Gospel of our time. The real evangelical bread, the nourishing aliment of the history as well as of the doctrine of Christ, has ever been taken by the Church from the three first Gospels, and it has availed itself of the addition of the fourth only in the way of seasoning. Luther's preference for the Gospel of John was connected with his doctrine of justification, to which the exaltation of the Divine personality of Jesus in it was welcome, and also with the mystical element in his nature and education. The preference for it in our own time arises from another cause, which may be described by saying that the character of the three first Gospels is considered to be that of simplicity, of the fourth sentimentality; the first are the classical, the fourth is the romantic Gospel. What Schiller says of the simple Poet, that he is severe and coy as the virgin Diana in her woods, that the dry truth with which he treats his subject appears not seldom as want of feeling, that his object has entire possession of him, that he himself retires behind his work and flies from the heart that seeks him, but that by reason of the truth and living presence in which he brings his object near to us, the impression given by his work will, even in the case of very pathetic subjects, be always cheerful, pure, and calm—all this is accurately applicable to our three first Gospels. And Schiller goes on to describe the distinction between the

simple and the sentimental Poet in these words: the former, he says, is powerful by the art of limitation, the latter by the art of the infinite. Then he explains this last observation by saying that the sentimental Poet reflects upon the impression which his object makes upon him, and that this reflection only is the cause of the emotion into which he is himself transported and into which he transports us; he refers his subject to an idea, and is always occupied with two opposing conceptions and sets of feelings, his idea as the infinite, and reality as the boundary; hence the emotion which he stirs up will be always a mixed one, the impression which he produces always an exciting and overstraining one. Reading these words, every one must see how strikingly they describe the impression given by the Gospel of John and the causes of this impression. The simple Poet, says Schiller, is he who is himself Nature, the sentimental he who seeks Nature. Thus we might say, the calmness, the clearness, the objectivity in the representation of Christ given by the Synoptics, come from this, that they had not to make their Christ, that they had only in the main to take him up and apprehend him as he was given in the conceptions of the Christian Church: on the other hand, the pathetic flight, the subjective emotion, the pulsating feeling of the Johannine Gospel, comes from this, that the composer has to begin with bringing down from heaven as it were his ideal of Christ, to invest it with historical forms, and to introduce it into the conception of the faithful.

And just on this account the Gospel of John, with its figure of Christ, is more in sympathy with the present generation than the Synoptics with the figure which they give. These latter, written under the influence of the calm certainty of the faith of the Church (for even the opposition between the liberal Jewish Christianity of the first Gospel and the moderate Paulinism of the third has comparatively little to do with the mode of apprehending the Person and Essence

of Christ), naturally answer to the calm certainty of the century of faith; the former, with its restless struggle to reconcile the new idea with the existing tradition, to represent what was subjectively certain as objectively credible, must correspond with the spirit of a period whose faith is no longer an undisturbed possession, but a continual fight, which would fain believe more than it really can believe. Looking to this side of the impression which it makes upon modern Christianity, we might also call the Johannine Gospel the romantic one, though in and for itself it is anything but a romantic production. The disquiet, the excited feeling which rises in the faithful of the present day from the effort still to maintain the ancient faith along with the new views which inevitably press upon it, sprung conversely in the case of the Evangelist from the endeavour to elevate the old tradition up to the level of the new idea, and to modify it accordingly; but the restlessness, the exertion, the flicker before the eyes, the unsteadiness of outline in the image thus produced, is the same on both sides, and therefore the modern Christian feels himself so especially attracted by this Gospel. The Christ of John, who is continually describing himself, and in doing so does, as it were, outdo himself, is the type of the modern believer, who, in order to be so, must himself continually outdo himself; the miracles of John, which must be always modified into the spiritual, and yet at the same time exaggerated as external miracles, which are told and announced in every way, and still are not to be the real ground of faith, are miracles and no miracles; we may believe them, and yet believe without them: exactly as this present half-hearted generation, that wears itself out in contradictions, that is too weak and spiritless to have a clear understanding and to utter a decisive word in religious matters, would like to do.

The author of the fourth Gospel is a Correggio, a master of the chiaroscuro. His drawing is often incorrect, but the

reflection of the colours, the mixture of light and shade produces the greatest effect. In the Synoptics the drawing is both more correct and more powerful, but there is less magical harmony of light and atmosphere; hence they appear to our time harsh and cold, while in the case of the fourth Evangelist it is considered that that one merit makes amends for all other faults.

As, however, they are often the simplest technical means by which the artist reaches the highest effects, the process applied by the fourth Evangelist may be considered an instance of this. I will only draw attention to one such artifice, even though the comparison may be objected to which I find useful for the illustration of my position. Goethe says once of the "Owlglass," that the principal jests in the book consist in everybody in it speaking figuratively, while "Owlglass" understands what is said literally. Thus the main effects of the interlocutory parts of the Gospel of John rest upon the converse cause, namely, upon Jesus speaking figuratively, and all other persons understanding what he says literally. When one individual among all is the only one who does not understand something, then he appears absurd. But if one individual is the only one who does understand something, then he appears elevated above the others.* If, in the first case, those who do understand are nothing but ordinary human beings, and nothing therefore particular attaches to that understanding, the single person who does not understand appears but only half a human being. Conversely, if the most educated and sagacious persons are among those who do not understand, then the single one who does understand must appear in the light of a demigod. If sometimes there is in the first case an exaggeration, the non-understanding being inconceivable, this is not a fault, as

* As is the case with the Jesus of John and the image of the new birth not understood by Nicodemus, and the metaphor of the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, at which the people of Capernaum took so much offence.

it increases the comicality of the effect, which is the thing intended; in the latter case, the exaggeration becomes a fault, as it injures the historical probability of the narrative, and makes the sublime resemble the absurd.

C.—CONSIDERATIONS PREPARATORY TO THE FOLLOWING
INVESTIGATION.

23. RETROSPECT.

In the first section of this Introduction we saw that all former attempts to represent the life of Jesus historically, failed for some one of the following reasons: they either followed the Gospels closely, assuming a personality in Jesus, and imagining powers as operative in life the like of which appear nowhere else in history, or they gave up the assumption, but in doing so still continued to regard the Gospels as historical sources of information throughout, and found themselves compelled to adopt a most unnatural explanation of them; or, lastly, wavering between two points of view, giving way and making admissions, shaken even in the belief of a thorough historical character of the Gospels, without having altogether got free from it, lost all firm scientific ground. In the second section we investigated the Gospels as sources of the history of Jesus, considering first the external testimony, then their internal character, and found that the external evidence, far from proving those writings to have come from eye-witnesses, or those who were near to the date of the Gospels themselves, or to the events narrated in them, leave, on the contrary, an interval open between that date and the composition of those writings, during which very much that is unhistorical may have been introduced; and that the internal character and the relation of the Gospels to each other are altogether those of writings which, having

been written in succession at this later period from different points of view, recount the facts not purely as they were, but metamorphosed by the ideas and struggles of this later period and its various tendencies. And as these original sources tell things of Jesus, the like of which we do not find in the life of any other man, and by reason of which all attempts hitherto made to give an historical representation of the life of Jesus have failed, we shall not henceforth consider ourselves bound on the authority of those writings to assume those things as having actually so happened, or, not being able to do this, to subject those writings, on the assumption that they must at all events be considered as historically credible, to an unnatural explanation; but leaving to these writings their miracles, we look upon them, as far as we are concerned, as mere myths. Miracle is, in the evangelical accounts of Jesus, that heterogeneous element which resists all historical treatment; the notion of the myth is the means whereby we separate it from our object and make an historical view of the life of Jesus possible. We must therefore, before proceeding further, say a few words upon these two ideas.

24. THE IDEA OF MIRACLE.

By a Miracle* is usually meant an event which, inexplicable from the operation and co-operation of finite causalities, appears to be an immediate interference of the supreme infinite Cause, or of God himself, the object of which is to prove or realise God's Being and Will in the world, in particular to introduce a divine Missionary into it, to preserve him in life, to guide him in his action, and above all to accredit him to mankind. This divine miraculous agency

* For what follows, comp. my *Dogmatik*, i. § 17, 224 ff.; (Zeller), the Tübingen Historical School, in Von Sybel's *Historical Journal*, iv. 101 ff.; (the same), *Historical Criticism and Miracles in general*, *ibid.* vi. 364 ff.

sometimes works through the divine Missionary, as a power given to him once for all for the purpose of accrediting him, a power the efficiency of which only requires invocation of God on the part of the worker of the miracle; sometimes God himself on his behalf breaks through the chain of natural events and causes a supernatural state of things; as in the case of the begetting of Jesus, to bring him into the world; of the miracles of the infancy, in order to proclaim him to the world and to preserve him in it; of the baptism, of the transfiguration, in order to glorify him; of the ascension, in order to bring him out of the world to the place to which from henceforth he belonged.

Such a course of events is never recognised by historical investigation, in so far as it is allowed to follow its own laws; on the other hand, we everywhere see religious faith making this assumption, in every instance indeed only in reference to the believer's own religious ground, so that the Christian considers the miracles of the original history of the Jews and Christians credible, but those of the Indian, Egyptian, Greek Mythology as fabulous and ridiculous; the Jew acknowledges the miracles of the Old Testament, but repudiates those of the New, &c. &c. Now the Christian faith calls upon Science to do the same, and not indeed to disallow the miracle altogether, but to allow it to exist within the Christian circle, and especially to have existed within that of original Christianity. Science, however, holds a position of far too great universality to indulge so narrow a pretension, and will say: I will recognise miracle as possible, either in all provinces of religious history, or I will recognise it in none; she will refuse, even though those who intercede with her may happen to be Jews or Christians, to be Science and especially Historical investigation in the interest of Jews, Christians, or others. In the alternative, however, given above, she does not intend to be serious with the second member of it, in which she expresses the necessity of allow-

ing Miracle in all departments of religion, if in any, and that for this reason, that to do so would be simply to abandon herself. It is the problem of historical investigation, not merely to discover what has really taken place, but also the mode in which one thing has been caused by another. But History must renounce the latter most honourable part of her problem the moment she is ready to admit the existence of Miracle, interrupting, as it does, the causation of one thing by another.

The historical investigator therefore, as such, would have justified sufficiently, from his own point of view, his refusal to acknowledge miracles in the evangelical history; but inasmuch as he is not merely an historical investigator, but a scientific man in general, or at least is supposed to be, his mode of discussing history will be drawn from a general survey of human and earthly things, and this view, even though not appearing in strictly philosophical form, will still be called the philosophy of that historical investigator. It is impossible that it can be unsuitable to an historical investigator to have a philosophy; only let thus much be said, that as philosophical systems are many, and he who is devoted to one of them generally rejects the others, he who rests his rejection of the miracle on philosophical grounds, destroys his chance of a general recognition of his process.

But here it fortunately happens that in the result with which we are here concerned, all philosophical theories, in so far as they lay claim to the name of philosophy, are agreed. If the so-called dogmatic systems unite in considering miracles impossible, the sceptic and critical systems must at least pronounce them to be unrecognisable and undemonstrable. As regards the first class of systems, it is self-evident that for Materialism, miracles are absolutely a nonentity. But Pantheism also has no God over the world, consequently none who could interfere from above with the order of this world; the laws of Nature are to it the essence, and the will of God,

identical with it, is the continual realisation of that essence; and to maintain that God can do anything against the laws of Nature, is, in the opinion of the Pantheist, the same thing as to maintain that God can act against the laws of his own essence. We might be most inclined to suppose that miracles would seem conceivable and admissible to Theism, with its personal God, separate from the world. In fact, this theory has popular forms which might also admit the possibility of miracles; but when it appears really as philosophy, it has always shewn itself irreconcilable with miracles. For the Theist cannot fail to see that a God who now at one time and then at another performs a miracle, consequently at one time exercises a certain kind of activity, at another time lets it rest, would be a Being subject to the conditions of time, and consequently not an absolute one; that, therefore, the action of God is to be understood rather as being an eternal act, as regards himself, simple and self-consistent, and only appearing on the side of the world as a series of individual, successive, divine operations. Thus Leibnitz looked upon miracles as a seed, as it were, which, having been planted by God in the world at the time of the creation, springs up when miracles are worked in the course of the development of the causes and effects implanted by that act, without further extraordinary interference on the part of God; and theologians were not wrong when, upon this theory, they considered that the power of God to act by separate immediate operations upon the world was destroyed. Wolf* declared more definitely that every miraculous interference of God with the course of nature would be a correction of the creation, consequently a proof of its imperfection, which must throw a shade over the Divine wisdom, and it is well known that this was Reimar's main point of support in his campaign against Biblical history and the doctrine of the Church.

* Comp. Kuno Fischer, Leibnitz and his School, p. 529.

On the side of the sceptical and critical philosophers, Hume's Essay on Miracles in particular carries with it such general conviction, that the question may be regarded as having been by it virtually settled. If upon the strength of evidence we are to look upon an event as having really taken place, we of course first test the credibility of that evidence. We consider whether it rests upon the declaration of eye-witnesses or persons at a distance, of many persons or of few; whether these agree in their declarations; whether they are to be looked upon as honest, truth-loving men; whether the author who tells us of the event was himself an eye-witness or not, and so forth. But supposing even that the evidence satisfied all the demands which we could make upon its credibility, still the question would remain as to the character of the event testified to by it. The Romans had a proverb—I would not believe the story even were it told me by Cato; which means, that there may be things so incredible in themselves, that this incredibility would invalidate the evidence of a witness in other respects the most credible of men. Supposing (Hume might have used this example) the 22nd chapter of the fourth book of Moses were really written by Moses, or by Balaam himself—supposing even that we had been present when he had just dismounted from his ass, and told the story in all its freshness of the ass having spoken to him in human words, and had been well known to us as an honest man—all this would do no good; but we should tell him downright that he is trifling, that he must have dreamt it, even if we did not lose our opinion of his honesty, and accuse him of absolute falsehood. In our own minds, we should balance the two probabilities, considering which was the greater, that a witness, apparently the most credible, should nevertheless have deceived us, or that an event should have happened contradicting all previous experience. In this case, if the event is one which, however unusual, lies nevertheless within

the limits of the natural, as, for instance (this example is made use of by Hume himself), if a Cato were to testify to us that a Fabius had been precipitate, possibly the one side might balance the other, and our judgment might remain in suspense. It is different if the event which I am to believe on evidence is a supernatural one, a miracle. For now the case stands thus. There are examples of testimony, even the most credible, given by eye-witnesses, by honest men, and so forth, having being false. These instances may be rare, but still there have been such. But, with the exception of the cases where credibility is in question, there are no instances of events demonstrably contradicting the laws of Nature. And on this point there is a quality assumed on the part of the evidence which does not belong to any of our evangelical accounts of miracles, not one of which has been recorded by an eye-witness, but all, on the contrary, by those who had received them from the tradition of others, and who shew, by the whole tendency of their writings, that they were disposed to do anything rather than to try the tradition they received by a critical test. There are innumerable examples of such witnesses having deceived; and therefore such evidence, compared with the enormous weight of the improbability of the event, falls into the scales only as a feather against a hundred-weight. Meanwhile, independent of this, and allowing the witnesses the best character, it is absolutely impossible to conceive a case in which the investigator of history will not find it more probable, beyond all comparison, that he has to deal with an untrue account, rather than with a miraculous fact.

There is so little to be urged directly against this argument, that an attempt is now ordinarily made to avoid it by weakening the idea contained in the word Miracle. Miracle, it is said, was nothing unnatural—nay, not even supernatural; the miraculous power of Jesus in particular was but a natural power of a higher kind—a healing power which, though it has

never appeared before or since, lay nevertheless within the limits of human nature. But, in the first place, this formula, as we saw above, leaves a considerable, and exactly the most important, part of the miracles worked by Jesus unexplained, as well as all those that were worked upon him; and if there is a key which opens for us all miraculous narratives collectively, we shall prefer it to one which does so only to a part of them, and after a very idle fashion too. In the next place, miracle, thus weakened, loses all power of proof. For a natural gift, a talent, as it is in fact called, stands at all times in an accidental relation to a man's moral worth; the best man may be without it, the worst may have it; and if the higher healing power of Jesus is, as is ordinarily done by the friends of this view, conceived of as having been in perfect analogy with the magnetic power, it becomes something so entirely corporeal, that no conclusion can be drawn from it with regard to the truth of the doctrine, to the superior dignity of the person of Christ. Jesus might have had it and yet have been an enthusiast, and in respect of the declarations about his own dignity, a swindler and an impostor.

25. THE IDEA OF MYTH.

In my former work I offered the idea of the Myth as the key to the miraculous narratives of the Gospel, and much else that in the accounts of the Gospels is opposed to an historical view. It is in vain, I said, in the case of stories like that about the star of the wise men, about the transfiguration, about the miraculous feeding, and the like, to attempt to make them conceivable as natural events; but as it is quite as impossible to imagine things so unnatural to have really happened, all narratives of this kind must be considered as fictions. If it were asked how, at the period to which the appearance of our Gospels is to be assigned, men came to

invent such fictions about Jesus, I pointed above all to the expectations of the Messiah* current at that time. When men, I said, first a few persons, then a continually increasing number, had come to see the Messiah in Jesus, they supposed that everything must have coincided in him which, according to the Old Testament prophecies and types, and their current interpretations, was expected of the Messiah. However notorious throughout the country it might be that Jesus was from Nazareth, still, as the Messiah, as the son of David, he must have been born in Bethlehem, for Micah had so prophesied. Jesus might have uttered words of severe reproach against the desire for miracles on the part of his countrymen, and those words might still be living in tradition; but Moses, the first deliverer of the people, had worked miracles, therefore the last deliverer, the Messiah, and Jesus had of course been he, must likewise have worked miracles. Isaiah had prophesied that at that time, *i. e.* the time of the Messiah, the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall bear; then will the lame man leap like a deer, and the tongue of the stammerer speak flowingly: thus it was known in detail what sort of miracles Jesus, having been the Messiah, must have performed. And so it happened that in the earliest Church narratives might—nay, could not fail to be invented, without any consciousness of invention on the part of the authors of them.

The assumption which I thus made, in agreement with the earlier theology, that Christianity found already existing in the Jewish theology of that time that conception of the Messiah which it saw realised in Jesus, not merely in general outlines, but more accurately defined, has not, as is well known, been without contradiction. According to Bruno Baur, the idea of the Messiah, as such, came into existence about the time of John the Baptist, and not sooner,

* Life of Jesus, critically discussed, i. p. 72 ff. of the first, p. 91 ff. of the fourth edition.

and was not completed in its several features even up to the time when our Gospels were composed, but was so first at that time and within the circle of Christianity.* Volkmar does not go quite so far as this. He acknowledges that the Jewish people expected, long before Christ, their deliverance from the yoke of the Gentiles by a personage sent from God, whom it called the Messiah, *i.e.* the anointed or consecrated King of the kingdom of God, only that from these ante-christian elements the later rabbinical additions must be distinguished, formed as they were in contrast with Christianity, subsequent to it, and being, to some extent, of a wild and extravagant character.† We see that the question here is only one of degree. Only a Bruno Baur could maintain that no definite idea of the Messiah had preceded Christianity. But I never maintained that the idea was in all its features clear and defined. It may be too much, with Gfrörer,‡ to distinguish four sorts of types of the Messiah which were current together at the time of Jesus, and which differed from one another according as the features constituting any type were compiled out of the older prophets, or taken out of Daniel, or formed upon the antitype of Moses, or if the Messiah was understood to be in a mystical sense the second Adam: but in this theory thus much at least is correct, that in the conception of the Messiah, characteristics from many various sources coincided, and the necessary result was a degree of uncertainty, the possibility of different modes of apprehension, and different combinations. Thus, in the passage of Micah (v. 1), understood in a Messianic sense, there was found the type of David as it lies at the bottom of the history of the birth in the first and third Gospels. On the other hand, in the same Gospels, in the appellation of

* Criticism of the Evangelical History of the Synoptics, i. 181, 391—416.

† The Religion of Jesus, p. 112 ff.; Introduction to the Apocryphas, ii. 398 ff.

‡ The Century of Salvation, ii. 219 ff.

Son of Man, and the speeches about the second advent in the clouds of heaven, the expressions of Daniel are applied. And when the Acts of the Apostles repeatedly (iii. 22, vii. 37) finds the promise about a prophet like to Moses (5 Mos. xviii. 15) fulfilled in Jesus, it brings in the type of Moses, without therefore giving up that of David or in Daniel. In Matthew (xi. 4) and Luke (vii. 22), Jesus refers the messengers of the Baptist for a proof that it was he who was to come, to the mode in which, through him, the blind receive their sight, &c. &c. Thus the Evangelists, in the passage in Isaiah (xxxv. 5 ff.) to which this expression of Jesus refers, found the miraculous acts stated which the Messiah was to perform. When, lastly, Luke (iv. 25 ff.) brings the good deeds done by Elias and Elisha to foreigners into prophetic relation to the rejection of Jesus by his countrymen, we are not surprised that miraculous acts performed by these two greatest of the prophets are copied in the history of Jesus. The rabbinical passages to which I referred for the programme of the acts of the Messiah* as drawn from the

* The two principal passages are, first, *Medrasch Koheleth*, f. 73, 3 (on *Ecclesiastes* i. 9: that which has been is that which shall be, &c.): Rabbi Berechia said, in the name of Rabbi Isaac: As was the first Saviour (Moses), so is also the last (the Messiah). What says the Scripture of the first Saviour? 2 Mos. iv. 20: And Moses took his wife and his sons, and set them upon an ass. So also the last Saviour, *Zech.* ix. 9: Poor, and sitting on an ass. What knowest thou of the first Saviour? He made manna come down, as it is said, 2 Mos. xvi. 14: See, I will rain upon you bread from heaven. So will also the last Saviour make manna come down, as it is said, *Ps.* lxxii. 16: There shall be an handful of corn upon the earth. How was it with the first Saviour? He made a well to spring. So will also the last Saviour make a well to spring, according to *Joel* iv. 18: And a spring will go forth from the house of the Lord, and water the brook Sittim.—Secondly, *Medrasch Tarchuma*, f. 54, 4: Rabbi Acha said, in the name of R. Samuel, Nachman's son: What God, the holy, the glorified, will do in the future (Messianic) time, that he has already done before by the hands of the righteous in this (pre-Messianic) time: God will wake the dead, as he did before by Elijah, Elisha and Ezekiel. He will dry up the sea, as was done by Moses. He will open the eyes of the blind, as he did by Elisha. God will in future time visit the barren, as he did Abraham and Sarah.—Comp. *Sohar* *Exod.* iv. b, and *Gfrörer*, the *Century of Salvation*, ii. 318 ff.

Old Testament, however late they may be, still shew correctly the peculiarity of the Jewish mode of thought under this head; and even Volkmar, in the Evangelical History of the Life of Jesus, finds, as I also had done, an imitation of the histories of David and Samuel, Moses and the two prophets. But it is certainly less probable that this dressing up of the image of the Messiah with features from the Old Testament was undertaken within the circle of Christianity, than that it was done in that of the later Jews; although even in the first case the mythical view of evangelical narratives of this kind is irrefragable.

The hypothesis that a considerable part of the New Testament myths originated in a transference of the Jewish expectations of the Messiah into the history of Jesus has been combated on the ground that on this assumption the earliest Christian Church would not have been in itself productive, but would simply have appropriated the results of a productiveness external to it. But the independent activity of the original Christian Church is by no means too much curtailed upon the assumption we have made. For, in the first place, not all the evangelical narratives which are to be considered as myths have this origin, but the Christian Church and its most ancient writers have also new ideas and experiences, though preferring the support of these Old Testament antitypes looked at as mythical histories. And in the next place, even in those narratives which are derived from that source, the new spirit of Christianity has not left itself without a witness. For of the miracles of Moses and the prophets in the Old Testament, why should only the charitable and beneficial, and not the numerous miracles of vengeance, have been imitated, except because the spirit of Christ was a different spirit from that of Moses and Elias? And the doctrines of faith, of the forgiveness of sins, of the true keeping holy of the Sabbath, which we find interwoven with the narratives of the miraculous cures in the New Tes-

tament, the thought that death is but a sleep which we find brought out in those of the raising of the dead, are nothing but so many Christian ideas breathed as a newer and better soul into those narratives, whether the subjects of them were taken out of the Old Testament or from the Jewish expectation of the Messiah.

By this view the original production of Christian Myths is placed upon the same footing as that of those which we find in the history of the rise of other religions. It is in this, in fact, that the progress which in modern times the science of theology has made consists,—in having, that is, comprehended how the Myth, in its original form, is not the conscious and intentional invention of an individual, but a production of the common consciousness of a people or religious circle, which an individual does indeed first enunciate, but which meets with belief for the very reason that such individual is but the organ of this universal conviction. It is not a covering in which a clever man clothes an idea which arises in him for the use and benefit of the ignorant multitude, but it is only simultaneously with the narrative—nay, in the very form of the narrative which he tells, that he becomes conscious of the idea which he is not yet able to apprehend purely as such. “The Myth,” says Welcker, “arose in the mind as a seed springs up from the soil: substance and form identical, the history a truth!”* But the more the evangelical Myths appear to have been, in part at least, newly and independently formed, the more difficult becomes the possibility of conceiving how the authors of narratives of this sort could have been unconscious that they were recounting as having happened something that had not really happened, but had been invented by them. He who first gave the account of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem might do so in good faith, for, according to Micah, the Messiah was to come from Bethlehem, and Jesus had

* Greek Mythology, i. 77.

been the Messiah, consequently must have been born in Bethlehem. He, on the contrary, who first told that on the decease of Jesus the curtain in the Temple was rent in twain (Matt. xxvii. 51), must have known, it would appear, that he had neither seen this happen nor heard it from any one, but that he had invented it himself. But in this very instance, an allegorical form of speech, such as we find in Heb. x. 19 ff., to the effect that the death of Jesus opened the way for us through the curtain into the Holy of Holies, might have been easily understood by a hearer in a literal sense, and thus that story have arisen entirely without consciousness of invention. In like manner the calling of the four disciples to be fishers of men may sometimes have been told in such a manner that the take of fish to which Jesus called them was contrasted with their earlier trade and its scanty profit, as being immeasurably more advantageous; and it is self-evident how easily, in the circulation of the story from mouth to mouth, the history of the miraculous draught of fishes (Luke v.) might hence arise. So also the accounts intended for the verification of the resurrection of Jesus have, at first sight, the appearance of being necessarily either historical or conscious falsehoods; and yet any one who identifies himself with the circumstances will see that it is not so. In the dispute upon this point, a Jew may have said: No wonder that the sepulchre was found empty, for of course you had stolen the body away. "We stolen it away!" said the Christian; "how could we have done that when you had certainly set a watch over it?" He believed this because he assumed it. Another Christian, telling the story after him, said still more decisively that the sepulchre had been watched, and the seal placed upon it was found in Daniel, whose den of lions naturally presented itself as an antitype of the sepulchre of Jesus, in which death could as little get the mastery over him, as the beasts in the den over Daniel. Or a Jew said: Yes, he may have appeared to you,

but as a disembodied spirit from the lower world. "As a disembodied spirit!" answered the Christian; "nay, but he had (this was a matter of course to the Christians), and moreover shewed us, the marks of the nails from his crucifixion." The next who told the story might understand that the showing involved also the allowing them to be felt, and thus narratives of this kind were formed quite in good faith, but still with no pretensions to be history.

But when we thus point out that an unconscious invention of such accounts was possible far beyond the limits within which they are generally considered admissible, we do not mean to say that conscious fiction had no share at all in the evangelical formation of myths. The narratives of the fourth Gospel especially are for the most part so methodically framed, so carried out into detail, that, if they are not historical, they can apparently only be considered as conscious and intentional inventions. In sketching the scene between Jesus and the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well, in the speeches and answers, the interchange of which he describes, the author of the fourth Gospel must have been as much conscious that he was inventing freely, as Homer when he described the interview between Ulysses and Calypso, or between Achilles and his divine mother. But in doing this, Homer was certainly at the same time conscious of the truth of his description; he believed that he was representing his gods and heaven in a manner exactly corresponding to their real nature, to the way in which they must have spoke and acted, that he was giving to his contemporaries the true and adequate conception of these beings. How then? may not the author of the fourth Gospel be supposed likewise to have had this consciousness? His Jesus could not have cut himself off, like a Jew, from the Samaritans, and having once come to Samaria, he could not have spoken otherwise than in this manner and with this effect; the work to which the Apostles afterwards succeeded must

have been begun before by the Master. So also in reference to the raising of Lazarus, it might be objected to criticism, that if there were no such person as Lazarus, except in the parable in Luke, none especially who was recalled into life by Jesus, the author of the fourth Gospel must have been conscious that in the whole of this history he was only telling to Christendom a fictitious tale. But independent of the fact that we do not know whether even previously to the composition of our fourth Gospel the legend had not changed the Lazarus of the parable into the real Lazarus, as even at the present day the two are united in the imaginations of a number of Christians, there were two things which the Evangelist considered as certain: first, that Jesus was the resurrection and the life, and next that he must have symbolically revealed this characteristic, as he did his entire glory, even during his earthly life. For such a symbol, such a warrant to guarantee the future resuscitation of those who had long before seen corruption, the raising of those just dead, instances of which were found already in the older Evangelists, did not appear to suffice; it was necessary that one at least should be raised from the dead in whom corruption had already begun; of this, which is the fundamental idea of his narrative, the Evangelist may already have been convinced from his own conception of Jesus. That all the details in the execution, as in the history of the Samaritan woman, were his own poetical additions, he must indeed have known; but, even in adding these details, he might still be persuaded that he was giving what was true: for the truth for which he strove was not literal truth, or recounting what had really taken place, but the full and complete expression of the idea: hence he made his Christ speak as the Christ spoke within himself; he made him move and act as he lived and moved in his own imagination; he, like the Apostle whose name he borrowed, wrote also an Apocalypse, only that he projected the figures of his mind, not, like the latter, on

the thunder-clouds of the future, but on the steady wall of the past.

It may be asked whether not only the unconscious poetry of legend, such as prevails in the first three Gospels, but also the more or less conscious fiction, the existence of which we cannot overlook in the fourth Gospel, is to be described by the term Myth. Now, it is well known with regard to the Greek mythology, from which the term is derived, that up to modern times no distinction has been made between the two, but all unhistorical religious narratives, however they may have arisen, were called myths. The older mythologists, up to the time of Heyne, have done this all the more, inasmuch as they knew of no distinction in the mode of the origination of myths, but looked upon them all, collectively and individually, not even excepting the most ancient, as the conscious and intentional inventions of individuals. It was not until men became conscious of this difference that the question could arise whether a distinction ought not to be made in the appellation also, and the name of mythus reserved exclusively for these original, unconscious formations, arising as it were of natural necessity. Several modern mythologists, especially Welcker in his work upon the Greek mythology, have pronounced in favour of this, and so weighty an authority may be appealed to by those who disallow the appellation in question to so much in the Gospels as is to be considered as conscious fiction. But Welcker may be perfectly right in his own department, and the theologians wrong in desiring to follow him. He who employs himself upon the Greek mythology works in a field with regard to the products of which it is assumed once for all that they have only an ideal and not an historical value; he may therefore seek finer distinctions, and mark them by separate appellations. On the other hand, the theologian who employs himself on the criticism of the Gospels operates within a circle of which it is assumed, conversely, that all that it contains possesses

historical value. When, in opposition to this assumption, he seeks to draw an inner circle, the figures within which, like those of the Greek mythology, are only supposed to have an ideal validity, he does well to choose for them only one common name, and for this purpose there is, I must maintain, by reason of the common connection that unites them, none more appropriate than that of Myth. As compared with the historical value always claimed for those narratives on the part of the more ancient theology, the finer distinctions vanish affecting the mode in which each of those narratives may have arisen: the main question is, not whether a narrative has been consciously or unconsciously invented, but whether it is history or fiction, and in the latter case the more accurate definition is, in a theological point of view, a secondary matter.

It always makes a peculiar impression on my mind when, in Baur's criticism on the Gospel of John, on occasion of the miracle at Cana, after he has rejected all subterfuges, such as explaining the miracle naturally or striking it out of the text of the Gospel, I read the question,* "But are we then, if the miracle is to maintain its absolute right, to allow ourselves to be driven to the mythical view?" and then the answer, "This also has been already rejected by every man of education up to the present day." For I imagined a faithful theologian to be reading this, and I thought how cheerfully he would breathe again at the passage, thinking he had found in such a critic as Baur a confederate against the "mythical view" of the Gospels, in opposition to which at that time, as if it had been an Erymanthian boar prowling round the country, every one who could carry a gun, or even spring a rattle, was up in arms. But when our good theologian read further on, "So much the more certainly can the narrative be understood only by referring it to the fundamental idea of the Evangelist," and found at last that what

* Critical Examination of Canonical Gospels, p. 121.

I explained to be a myth, Baur declared to be a mere fiction of the Evangelist; then I saw our reader, cruelly undeceived, lay aside the book, shake his head, and turn a deaf ear to the assurance that it is a totally different thing to derive such a narrative from the idea of the Evangelist, and to derive it from the Old Testament symbols. Historical or unhistorical? true or untrue? that was the question for him, and having been disturbed by some one being bold enough to say the history is not true, he was but poorly consoled by some one else coming forward and assuring him that it is, on the contrary, invented.

Baur gives as a reason why narratives like those of the miracle at Cana, of the raising of Lazarus, are not adapted to being brought under this mythical point of view, the following: Where reflection prevails so decidedly, where the representation in its entire outline points so methodically to a definite idea, the supposition of a myth must be out of place. Now, according to Ewald's view, the most important miraculous narratives in the Gospels are only reflections and mental images, from which, before they can be explained, the thought that is reflected in them must first be abstracted. And of him Baur says, on this very account, that he does in point of fact stand upon the mythical point of view, only will not admit the term of myth.* Ewald indeed does disallow the term myth and mythical, not only to a definite class of narratives, but to the entire department of Biblical criticism; not, he says, from fear of men, but because the nature of the myth is identified with heathenism, and the word is a foreign word, *i.e.* in its application to the Gospels, introduced by somebody who is not Ewald.† Baur has not altogether excluded the idea of myth from the evangelical history; he has, on the

* The Tübingen School, p. 158 of the second edition.

† Annual of Biblical Science, ii. 66. Professor Ewald, says R. W. Mackay, in his profound work, "The Tübingen School and its Antecedents," p. 345,—Prof. Ewald, to whom the celebrity of any opinion, not emanating from himself, is

contrary, admitted the applicability of it in particular to the fundamental basis of the evangelical tradition as it is found in Matthew;* but he has as much as possible avoided the word, and always treated the "mythical view" as one which is foreign to and contrasted with his own. But when, in doing so, he claims for the latter a conservative character in comparison with mine,† it is not indeed easy to see on what ground such a character should belong to it. For the idea of *Tendency* which Baur substituted for that of myth, which predominates in my theory, or the rule that a historical description is less historical in proportion as a definite character of Tendency‡ shews itself in it, is likewise only a criterium of the unhistorical element. And considering that in the case of those narratives in which no particular tendency, but only the general character of the freely growing legend, is observable, room is still left for the mythical view, Baur certainly had not his own principles to thank if in the evangelical history he did not declare it, even more than I did, to be of an unhistorical character.

In this new discussion of the life of Jesus, I have, mainly in consequence of Baur's hints, allowed more room than before to the hypothesis of conscious and intentional fiction; but I have seen no reason to change the term. On the contrary, to the question which asks whether conscious fictions of an individual are properly to be called myths, I am bound, even after all the discussions upon the point, to reply:

sufficient reason for condemning and contradicting it, &c. Adding what the same author, p. 343, says: Ewald wraps his virtue in an obscurity of inflated verbiage; and, p. 351, note, that his maxim is, "denounce your adversary in unmeasured terms for what he says, and then in slightly varying language quietly adopt his suggestions," we see with satisfaction how accurately our great man of Göttingen is already known on the other side the Channel.

* Critical Examination of the Canonical Gospels, p. 603.

† Church History of the Nineteenth Century, p. 399. Comp. Critical Examination, p. 72 ff.

‡ Critical Examination, p. 76.

Certainly, as soon as they have gained belief and passed into the legend of a people or a religious sect; for their having done so invariably shews at the same time that they were formed by their author not merely upon notions of his own, but in connection with the consciousness of a majority. Every historical narrative, however it may have arisen, in which a religious community recognises a component part of their sacred origin as being an absolute expression of constituent feelings and conceptions, is a myth;* and though Greek mythology may have an interest in separating off from this extended idea of the myth a more contracted one, critical theology, conversely, as against the so-called believers, has an interest in combining all those evangelical narratives to which it attributes only an ideal meaning, under the one common notion of myth.

26. PLAN OF THE WORK.

Over and above this peculiar apparatus for causing miracles to evaporate in myths, the criticism of the evangelical history will naturally avail itself of all means and instruments which historical criticism in general cannot dispense with for its operations, but which, simply because they are common to all historical criticism, do not here require any particular mention.

In the application of these means, in the arrangement of the critical process, the analytical method was adopted in my earlier discussion of the Life of Jesus: *i.e.* I worked from the exterior to the interior: from the husk to the kernel, I endeavoured to penetrate from the upper strata to the primæval rock. Criticism started from the different modes of explaining and apprehending the several evangelical

* Life of Jesus, fourth edition, p. 96; Julian, p. 64.

narratives, endeavoured by separating off what was inadmissible to arrive at what was true, and striving to account for the origin and formation of the narrative under discussion from time to time, concluded by pointing out what might have formed the historical kernel in it. In her first essays of these times, Criticism could not proceed otherwise; the ground of evangelical history had been up to that time shut up as holy, and she was compelled to win it step by step; to make, as it were for herself, with arms in her hand, the road from the coast into the interior of the country. That was indeed a tedious and a roundabout method. But even the fact that it was roundabout had its advantages. Not a step forwards could be taken without a theological prejudice being broken down, a dogmatic mistake exposed, an exegetical error corrected. And therefore for those who followed the course of criticism, this was a good school, and the work which took this course will always continue to be one of the most instructive for old as well as young theologians. Still, this process was not without sensible disadvantages. In the first place, as we took the road from the exterior to the interior, as we pierced from the upper stratum to the one below, the course of criticism was exactly the reverse of that which the thing itself had taken in its natural development. Criticism started from what was latest, in order to come at last to what had been, in reality, earliest. In the second place, criticism started from separate evangelical narratives, and it was only after she had tested each one of them that she could point out how much of them was to be considered as historical remainder after deducting the mythical additions. And it is true indeed that in the case of a number of narratives such small remainder did result, but there was no place for summing up these figures and developing in one result what might have been the truth as regards the person and history of Christ looked at from a strictly historical point of view.

It appeared therefore advantageous for the completion of the earlier process, and at the same time in accordance with the advance that science has made in the mean time, to strike on the present occasion into the synthetical path, the converse of the former. Reserves so powerful have supported the author of the Life of Jesus since the time when he penetrated from the coast to the capital of the country, that the capture may be considered as ensured, the fortified spot in the centre of the country gained once for all. At all events, we now know for certain what Jesus was not, and did not do; that is, nothing superhuman or supernatural; and thus it will be all the more possible for us to follow the intimations of the Gospels as to the natural and human in him, so far as to be able to shew, at least in rough outlines, what he was and what his object was. We shall therefore on this occasion start from the presumable historical kernel of the history of Jesus, which in the earlier work was never represented as a unity. We shall recognise the faith in his resurrection that arose in the disciples of Jesus as the first effect of what was in Jesus; but in doing so we shall find the conception of him transferred into a temperature in which it could not fail to put forth numerous unhistorical shoots, one ever more miraculous than another, in the most luxurious growth. The inspired Son of David becomes a Son of God, begotten without a father; the Son of God becomes then the Creative Word that was made flesh; the miraculous physician, the friend of mankind, becomes one who raises the dead, the absolute monarch over nature and her laws; the wise teacher of the people, the prophet who looks into the hearts of men, becomes the Omniscient, God's second I; he who in his resurrection went up to God came also forth from God, had been in the beginning with God, and his earthly existence was only a short episode by which he interrupted his eternal existence with God for the benefit of men. On the present occasion, our criticism will follow step by step the course of things, *i.e.* the gradual

development of the conceptions formed of Jesus, the enrichment of the history of his life with traits ever more and more ideal. It will draw attention to the first deposits of the unhistorical, then shew how over every layer a new one formed, how every one of these layers was only the precipitate from the former conceptions of the period and the circle within which it grew, till at last with the Gospel of John a resting point was gained, beyond which a further advance, and at the same time a higher spiritualization, was no longer possible, and also no longer required. This exposition will not only have a historical, but also the dogmatical value of serving as a verification of our opinion of the character of the evangelical history. When a writer disallows historical validity to a generally credited history, not only the reasons for his opinion may be justly demanded of him, but also an explanation of the mode in which the unhistorical narrative arose. And this explanation I hope to be able to give in my second book.

While thus following the course of things, we should not consider it as necessary, on its own account, to concern ourselves with the views and explanations, differing from our own, of other theologians. We might, in the present work, keep entirely clear of that from which we started in the earlier one, and which we considered as one of the principal problems. We might do this with all the more propriety, as those theological explanations and harmonizations are ordinarily nothing but attempts to seduce Criticism from the direct road, and to involve her in apologetic quibbles from which there is no escape, without, at any rate, loss of time. Add to this, that as there was, even at the time when the earlier work was published, a considerable number of these apologetic subterfuges, so now the number of them has become Legion. It is as in a dry autumn with the field mice: tread up a hole, and six new ones open instead. When one reads a solid work, like that of Zeller on the Acts of the

Apostles, in which, with a profundity and patience deserving of the highest acknowledgment, every theological evasion, even the most miserable, is noticed, every allegation against criticism, however unfounded, is met, the cunning antagonist is repelled from every loophole, one cannot avoid the question whether a scientific man can be expected to "lay about him in such a mob," to trouble himself with it, and so allow himself to be stopped in the direct course of scientific criticism? Even as regards evidence and convincing power of proof, it may be a question whether a work does not lose more by the constant breaking off of the thread of development of the subject, than it can gain by the completeness of its refutation of opposing views. About the cry of the theologians, that their opponents made the case easy to deal with, because they took no notice of the grounds upon which the orthodox cause rests, *i. e.* have simply passed by their paper fortifications without thinking them worth a regular blockade, an essay would have but little cause to trouble itself which is intended, not in any way for theologians, but for educated and thinking men of all conditions and callings. Still, I should not like, even for the joke's sake, to raise myself altogether above the task. But on the present occasion, unless the direct road leads me in that direction, I shall only make a halt, in any case, where there is a promise of advantage—that is, in those places in which the most prolific nests of these vermin have settled. And thus proofs will be given to the reader of the way in which, in the case of problems which naturally solve themselves by our critical method, the conservative theology of the present day wears itself out with the most extravagant contortions and the strangest antics.

First Book.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

First Book.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

27. PREFATORY REMARKS.

As a proof that the recognition of the miraculous is not to be avoided in the department of Christianity, it is usual to describe the origin of Christianity itself as the greatest miracle. It is useless, it is said, for infidel science to give itself the trouble to point out the causes in the period immediately preceding Christianity which may account for such an effect; the disproportion between the two conditions is so great, that in this case, as well as in that of the first origin of organic beings, or the beginning of the human race, it is impossible to explain the difficulty without assuming an immediate interference of the Divine power of creation.

Undoubtedly, if we were able to point out historically all the conditions which made the rise of Christianity possible—to point them out, too, in such perfection that cause and effect corresponded to each other—the view which sees a miracle in that rise would be thus contradicted, because the miracle would thereby be proved superfluous; and a superfluous miracle, even on the standpoint of belief in miracles, should never be assumed. But it does not follow from this that because means are wanting for thus pointing out these causes, we are bound therefore to recognise a miracle. For the fact that the circumstances which involved the causes productive of Christianity are now no longer known, is not the same thing as no such causes having been in existence. On the contrary, we see plainly how it happens that we

know but little of these causes, notwithstanding their having existed. With regard to the state of cultivation of the Jews in Palestine, we have but very defective accounts direct from the century which preceded the age of Jesus. The main sources of our knowledge are the New Testament and the writings of Josephus. The first, turning as it does upon Jesus and the faith in him, and apprehending him only as a supernatural phenomenon, explicable from notions that had gone before, gives us, with regard to what we are looking for, only a few hints incidentally and as it were unwittingly. Josephus, who wrote his two principal works, that upon the Jewish War and the Jewish Antiquities in Rome after the destruction of Jerusalem, treats indeed at great length of the political and dynastic circumstances of Judea during the period in question; and, as regards the account of the state of education of the Jews, we owe to him the most accurate information we possess respecting the three Jewish sects. But it is precisely over that side of the religious opinions of his people which would be the most important for our purpose, their expectations of the Messiah, that he purposely throws a veil, in order not to excite the political suspicion of the Romans, which not without reason attached to these expectations. And with this may also be connected the fact, that of Christianity and its founder he either makes no mention at all, or, even if the famous passage be genuine, very unsatisfactory.* The writings of the Alexandrian Jew, Philo, which, being still earlier, may possibly fall in part into the lifetime of Jesus, and are very instructive as to the state of

* The passage, however, Jewish Antiquities, xviii. 3, 3, is certainly interpolated in every part of it. But even supposing it were not, it collapses into such an unmeaning notice, that it is inconceivable how the author could interrupt his narrative for the purpose of introducing it, as xviii. 3, 4, stands in close connection with xviii. 3, 2. I look upon the whole passage, which is indeed found in Eusebius' Church History, i. 11, 7 ff., as a Christian interpolation, and, in support of this opinion, appeal to the very different impression made by the passage on the Baptist, *ibid.* xviii. 5, 2, p. 166.

cultivation at that time of the Egyptian Jews, admit of only doubtful inferences with regard to the circumstances of the mother country. Conversely, the Talmud is indeed in its elementary component parts of Palestinic origin, and contains among them, without doubt, accounts which reach up into the period before Christ; but its conclusion falls so late that no reliance is to be placed upon it. As to the Apocalyptic writings, the fourth Book of Esra and the Book of Enoch, which it was customary for some time to make use of as sources of information for the two centuries before Christ, a question has lately been raised whether they do not more probably belong to the first and second centuries after him. Lastly, as regards the Greek and Roman writers, they knew and cared so little about what was passing in Palestine that they give us no information about the circumstances that prepared the way for Christianity; and of Christianity itself they shew no accurate knowledge until it had long overstepped the frontier of Palestine, and might be considered in its main features as an accomplished fact.

Nevertheless, in the little that we know, on the one side, of the particular circumstances of the Jewish people in the period before the appearance of Christ, and, on the other, in the more extensive information which we have about the state of cultivation of the nations in general at that time, we have data enough to leave scarcely anything more enigmatical in the rise of Christianity than at any epoch in history, whether of art or science, of religious or political life, is found in the personal element, the appearance of the gifted individual who is destined, when sufficient fuel has been collected, to throw into it the spark that is to set it on fire.

I know not whether the most supernatural origin that can be ascribed to Christianity can be more honourable for it than the endeavour to shew by historical investigation that it was the ripe fruit of all the movements that up to that time

had taken place as a higher effort of the mind in all branches of the great human family. In connection with this, it has been already said that in order to comprehend Christianity in its origin, we should not look to Judaism alone, upon the soil of which it undoubtedly grew up, but not until this soil had been penetrated and saturated with matter which came from without. Christianity, we might say, would never have become the religion of the West as well as of the East—nay, in the sequel have continued to be especially that of the West—had not, in its origin and first formation, the West together with the East, the Greco-Roman spirit together with the Jewish, participated in it. Judaism must have been pounded in the terrible mortar of history, the Israelitish people must have been scattered by their repeated wanderings among the other nations of the earth, and thereby many channels opened, so as to admit foreign cultivation to the mother country, before it got the power causing such a product as Christianity to issue from it. Especially must the marriage between the East and the West in the form in which it was brought about by the great Macedonian, have gone before, the bridal bed as it were of this union must have been firmly laid in Alexandria before such a phenomenon as Christianity could have been conceived. Had no Alexander gone before, no Christ would have come after, is a proposition that sounds blasphemous in theological ears, but which loses all offence as soon as we are conscious that even the hero has a divine mission.

If for a moment, following the ordinary form of expression, we consider Judaism and Heathenism as the two factors which must have played into each other's hands to produce the new Religion of the world, we also reckon on the side of the first those influences which had been exercised upon Judaism by the oriental religions, and especially by the Persian, during and after the captivity. By the heathen factor, we understand in the first place the Greek cultivation ;

in the second, the firm organisation of the Roman empire, to which the Jewish country and nation were attached just about the time of the birth of Jesus. Thus we have as it were two lines, each carried forward by an effort of its own, and yet destined at last to coincide in one point, which was to become the seat of the origin of the new Religion. If we would describe by a short formula the aims of those two lines apparently so opposite to each other, and yet making for the same point at last, we might say that Judaism in all stages of its development sought God; Grecianism, in like manner, man.

28. DEVELOPMENT OF JUDAISM.

Judaism thought it had found the former when, in opposition to the plurality of the gods of Egypt and Palestine, tangible and worshipped in a tangible form, it had become conscious of the one Jehovah, spiritual and without form or likeness. In this consciousness they stood alone among the nations of the earth, and thus the God so known was theirs, Israel was his peculiar property, and there was developed between the people and their God a relation of league or contract, by the terms of which the first bound itself to a ceremonial carefully regulated service, the latter bound himself to grant to this people, provided they followed this service, his mighty protection against all other peoples, his own especial blessing. That knowledge of the One true God had not opened upon the people as a whole, but only upon a few exalted minds among them, while the mass ever continued to hanker after the polytheistic worship of their neighbours, which was offered to beasts and idols. On the other side there were but few traces of the especial protec-

tion promised to Israel by their Jehovah, save, with few interruptions, there was scarcely ever a people that met with greater obstacles than the chosen people of the Jews. This circumstance was indeed represented by the priests and prophets of the one God as a punishment for the disobedience of the people; the people, on the contrary, might excuse their unwillingness to worship such a God by pointing to the absence of the peculiar protection of which the prospect had been held out to them.

The founders of the Jewish religion took the custom of offering sacrifices from the usages of the nations round them, and preserved it. This was not only natural, but also advantageous to the nation which, adapting itself with so much difficulty to the idea of an intangible God, would never have acquiesced in a form of worship without sacrifice. Still the worship of an invisible Being by bloody sacrifices of animals was a contradiction; sensuous service was unsuited to a super-sensuous God, and might easily seduce the people back again to those sensuous gods to whose nature it corresponded better. The more the nobler minds of the nation conceived the one God as the Creator indeed of external nature, but still as a spiritual essence and moral power, so much the more must they also have been enlightened as to this truth, that the true worship of this God must consist, not in sacrifice or other outward act, but in the purification of the heart and of the life.

It is well known that this was the view to which the so-called prophets had attained, and those especially among them who appeared in succession from the time of the separation of the kingdom of the ten tribes until the return from the Babylonish captivity, impressing it also upon the hearts of the people. "I hate," says Jehovah by the mouth of Amos, "I despise your feast days; though you offer me burnt-offerings, I will not accept them; I will not hear the melody

of thy viols; but let judgment run down as water, and righteousness as a mighty stream." Again he says in Hosea (vi. 6), "For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." Isaiah preaches the same everywhere, and Micah asks (vi. 6 ff.), "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rivers of oil? He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good: and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Lastly, Jeremiah goes so far as to make Jehovah say plainly to the people (vii. 22 ff.): "I spake not unto your fathers nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Obey my voice and I will be your God."

All this, however, was far from being intended in the sense that the spiritualization of the religion should be pushed so far as to exclude the sacrificial element, or the ceremonial worship be given up when the moral worship was adopted. Even the gifted author of the latter part of the prophecies of Isaiah, who requires as the proper accompaniment of fasting, not hanging down of the head and attitudes of penitence, but works of charity and love, desires still the observance of fast-days (xxviii. 3 ff.), and especially lays great stress upon the keeping of the Sabbath holy (lvi. 1 ff., lviii. 13 ff.). The Jewish people, after the captivity, found itself compelled to this observance of festivals among the hereditary usages of their religion, especially by the circumstances that, confronted as they were with the pressure brought to bear upon them by the powerful empires of the world, forming in succession in the neighbourhood, they saw no other mode of maintaining their exclusiveness and independence. Hence it is that from this moment we no more see them take

pleasure in relapsing into heathen idolatry ; but still, on the whole, we do not observe, going hand in hand with this, any spiritualization of the religion, but, on the contrary, a growing anxiety fully to satisfy the outward directions of the worship. Once, under the reign of the Seleucidæ, Greek modes of thought and Greek ethics seem to have found an echo among the Jews in Palestine, in consequence of the road to the East which Alexander had opened for Greek cultivation ; but the religious and national peculiarity of the people had still power enough to repel the foreign element by means of the rising of the Maccabees, after which it only shut itself up more obstinately and more exclusively within its own self-complacent ceremonial worship. Thus in later Judaism, when we compare it with the standpoint of the prophets before the captivity and during it, a retrograde step is not to be mistaken. In its tendency to external service towards the God whom it was seeking, to multiplication of ceremonies and subtle extension of them, Judaism had gone incomparably further than the prophets who saw his presence in the mind of man, in righteousness and love of mankind.

But this tendency to spiritualize the religion had been accompanied, in the prophets, by another. They made the elevation of Israel to a genuine piety the indispensable condition of the return of better times : Jehovah would first purge and sift his people by punishment, melt away the dross and wash off impurity (Isaiah i. 25 ff., iv. 3 ff. ; Mal. iii. 2 ff.), then pour out his Spirit upon the converted and the cleansed of sin, make a new covenant with them and write his law within their hearts (Jerem. xxxi. 31 ff. ; Ezekiel xi. 19 ff., xxxvi. 26 ff. ; Joel iii. 1 ff.), before the beginning of that new and happier period. But while that better future was thus delineated according to the type of the good old times which the people had enjoyed under king David, there was combined with the hope of this the expectation of a sovereign of David's sort, from the lineage of David, who

should raise his people out of the depth of their present ruin to a height of power and prosperity surpassing even the days of the David of old. When, after the annihilation of the kingdom of the ten tribes by the Assyrians, that of Judah also found itself threatened by them, the prophet Isaiah (xi. 1 ff.) promised that the enemy, now so overpowering, shall in a short time be made harmless. Then there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots, a Ruler upon whom the Spirit of Jehovah shall rest, who shall rule with justice and power in the inward mind, bring in a golden age, restore the kingdom of Israel, and put an end to its ancient quarrel with Judah, then with power thus united bring into subjection the nations that dwell around; and with this, moreover, the conversion of those nations to the religion of Jehovah was supposed to be connected (Micah iv. 1 ff.; Isaiah xviii. 7, xix. 17 ff., lx. 1 ff.). And later, when the execution of judgment upon Judah was on the point of taking place at the beginning of the Babylonish captivity, Jeremiah prophesied (xxxiii. 1 ff., xiv. ff.) the future restoration of the wasted land under a scion of David, whose rule he described in the same terms as Isaiah had done before. Ezekiel, prophesying in Babylon (xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24), gives this a turn to the effect that it will be David himself who, as the good shepherd, shall feed the restored and united people.

But while an opposition between the priesthood and the prophets on the one hand, and the sovereign power on the other, prevails through the whole history of the people of Israel, the expectation of a Messiah started not merely from David, but also from Moses. The author of Deuteronomy, living in the times of Josiah, puts into the mouth of the departing lawgiver the promise (5 Mos. xv. 15), that Jehovah will raise up to his people out of the midst of them a prophet like unto him; a promise which, though meant generally of the continuance of the prophetic order, still, as

we see from the first Book of the Maccabees (iv. 46), and the New Testament (*e.g.* John vi. 14; comp. iv. 19 ff.; Acts iii. 22) was subsequently understood of a single Prophet like the Messiah. We shall see in the sequel what effect this Mosaic type of the Messiah has upon the framing of the history of Jesus in the Gospels. The prophet Malachi, living after the captivity, instead of connecting the hope of the future with the Lawgiver, connects it with the prophet Elijah who had been raised up to heaven, whom Jehovah will send, before his terrible day of judgment, for the conversion of the people (iii. 23 ff.; comp. Sirach xlviii. 10 ff.); a hope which we find in the New Testament so combined with the expectation of the Messiah descended from David, that Elijah was expected as the forerunner of the Messiah.

In the passage of Ezekiel, the name of David had been understood as being literally that of the departed King who was to rise again. And thus the person of him who was expected was transferred into the supernatural, many important expressions in the earlier prophets (as Isa. xi. 5 ff.) admitting of being explained in the same manner. But the book of Daniel, written about the time of the Maccabees, gave a description (vii. 13 ff.) which told decisively in favour of giving this turn to the idea of the Messiah. In the vision of the Prophet, after the judgment on the four beasts who represented the four great kingdoms of the world which had existed up to that time, one "as of a Son of Man" appears in the clouds of heaven, is brought before the throne of God, and invested by him with everlasting dominion over all peoples. It is very possible (according to ver. 27) that this human form might only be meant by the author as a type of the people of Israel, as the forms of the beasts were types of the barbarian nations who up to that time had exercised dominion over the world. Still the reference to the Messiah was too obvious to be passed over; though the period at which that reference was first made has been lately under

dispute, together with the age of the fourth book of Ezra and of the book of Enoch.*

It is also uncertain when the name of Messiah (in Greek, Christ), or the Anointed, was adopted for the expected Deliverer. In the Old Testament we never find it used except of kings, or prophets, and priests (3 Mos. iv. 3; 1 Sam. xxiv. 7, 11; Ps. cv. 15; Dan. ix. 25 ff.; comp. 2 Mos. xxviii. 41; 1 Sam. x. 1; 1 Kings xix. 16); but the appellation presented itself as especially suitable to the Prophet and King in the highest sense, who was to be furnished by God, as none other had been, with his divine gifts, and as, besides in the New

* In both of these apocryphal books the supposed reference in the passage of Daniel to the Messiah, and the conception of the latter as a being pre-existent in the super-terrestrial world, is not to be mistaken.

In Ezra he ascends in the vision of the prophet, in a human form out of the sea, and flies with the clouds of heaven (xiii. 1 ff., Volkmar's ed.); in Enoch he appears with the Ancient of Days with a face as the face of a man, and is repeatedly called Son of Man, and of Man or Woman (xlvi. 1, xlviii. 2 ff., lxii. 5, 7, lxix. 27, 29, Dillman's ed.). In Ezra he has been kept with God for a length of time, together with those who were translated (Enoch, Moses, Elijah, in upper Paradise), to appear at length for the deliverance of the creature, and dominion over the chosen people (xiii. 2 ff., 25 ff.; comp. v. 28, xii. 32); in Enoch his name has been invoked even before creation: God has hidden him with himself, and only revealed him to the chosen people, until he shall some time make him sit upon the throne of his glory and hold judgment (xlviii. 2 ff., 626 ff.). I do not pretend to decide the question as to the ante or post-Christian origin of the two books, which has been argued with learning and acuteness on both sides (on the one principally by Hilgenfeld, *Jewish Apocalypics*, p. 91 ff., 185 ff., the *Prophets Ezra and Daniel* [1863], and in different treatises in the *Journal of Scientific Theology*; on the other by Volkmar, *Manual of Introduction to the Apocryphal Books* [1863], ii.; *Contributions to the Elucidation of the Book of Enoch*, *Journal of German Oriental Society*, 1860, p. 87 ff.). But as to 4 Ezra, the composition of the book about 97 A. D. appears to me to be fixed by the mention of the face of the eagle; and as regards Enoch, the two chief disputants are agreed upon the post-Christian, nay, Christian origin of the portion which contains the passages quoted above, and similar ones. In like manner, in the so-called Sibylline Prophecies, all those passages which undoubtedly speak of a pre-existence and higher nature of the Messiah, belong to later portions of the collection; everything of this kind that is found in the ante-Christian portions, as for instance the King to be sent from heaven (iii. 286 ff., Friedlieb's ed.), the Immortal King (iii. 48), the King who comes from the Sun (iii. 652 ff.), is in part of doubtful allusion—in part, even if it alludes to the Messiah, does not exceed the ordinary exaggeration of Jewish phraseology.

Testament, it is also applied in the fourth book of Ezra, and in the book of Enoch.*

It is evident at once what different elements were combined in the image of the Messiah so wonderfully composed. The moral religious element indeed, in so far as a purifying of the nation was considered, partly as a condition of his appearing, partly also as an effect to be produced by the expected Ruler, was not forgotten; but not only did the political element prevail, and was naturally understood by the multitude in its harshest form of an eradication, or at all events subjugation, of all the heathen by the chosen people, but there was also an admixture of enthusiasm and fanaticism, greater in proportion to the supranaturalism of the conception entertained of the future Deliverer. The expectation of the Messiah had on the one hand been constantly becoming more and more a peculiar national idea, the last refuge of a fallen unhappy people; on the other, this idea was of so equivocal a nature, that it was difficult to decide whether it was granted to the people as a means of possible relief, or intended to carry them down absolutely into the abyss of ruin. Apart from the enterprise of Jesus, which was of no advantage to the nation as such, the idea of the Messiah in these last days of the Jewish commonwealth resulted only in ruinous undertakings, and rebellions against the Roman power ending in mischief and damage to themselves.

The result of the long-continued religious development of the Jewish people exhibits itself to us, before the close of their existence as a nation, in the rise of those sects† which we find so influential about the time of Jesus, and the growth of which, or at all events their more complete development, falls into the period succeeding the insurrection of the Maccabees. There is little doubt that they were the best living powers

* Ezra v. 28, xii. 31 ff.; Enoch xlviii. 10, lii. 4.

† Josephus treats of these in the "Jewish War," ii. 8, 2—14; in the "Antiquities," xiii. 5, 9, xviii. 1, 2—5.

in the Israelitish people, combining as they did to rebel against the Greek heathenism which Antiochus attempted to force upon them. But quite as little is the possibility excluded of these powers, even after the fortunate result of the struggle, having by degrees crystallised into tendencies so offensive as that of Pharisaism was. But we have ourselves lived to see following that movement, certainly a healthy one, to which we owe our deliverance from the yoke of France—we have lived to see romantic Germanism, a tendency which stands in a relation to the German nature similar to that in which Pharisaism stood to that of the Jews. When a people repels the foreign elements forced upon it in politics, in morals, and in the case of the Jews in religion also, and again brings out its peculiarity into strong relief, it also readily rejects whatever good there may have been in the foreign nationality, fortifies itself in its exclusiveness, and labouring to develop to the utmost everything by which in the forms of its outward life it is distinguished from other nations, it falls, or rather they fall who keep this tendency even after it has done its historical duty, a prey to a spirit of externalism, which in its zeal for the form forgets the essence. With all this there is then combined, in such a party, that obstinate defiance which will abandon none of the national claims, make no sacrifice to the changed circumstances of the time, and is ever inclined in consequence to rebellion and mutiny against rulers, so far as they are established through the agency of these circumstances. It would only have been possible for the sect of the Pharisees to satisfy these national claims if it had been capable of breathing a new spirit into the people, of elevating them from within, morally and religiously; but this was the very thing that this party made no attempt to do, inasmuch as by the whole of their conduct they rather misled the people into the delusion of thinking that externals were sufficient; that when they had satisfied the demands of these by a

punctual observance of ceremonial worship, then God would certainly take notice of this, and would assist them by means of the Messiah to the highest worldly prosperity, to a place above all other nations of the earth.

With these obstinate and narrow-minded Jewish pedants, the Sadducees were contrasted as enlightened men of the world. The fact that they, in opposition to the Pharisaic system of ordinances, modelled by oral tradition upon the foundation of the Mosaic law, recognised solely the written word of the law as the source of religion and religious exercises, gives them a sort of Protestant character; their rejection of the Pharisaic desire of reward, and the requirement to practise virtue for itself, approximates them to the Stoics; and that which is connected with the denial of the Resurrection, of the existence of angels and spirits, resembles the materialistic philosophy of the Epicureans. It is possible that some philosophemes of this kind had continued floating in the minds of educated Jews since the time when under the earlier Seleucidæ Greek education and Grecian fashions had penetrated among them; though similar maxims had been delivered by the Preacher Solomon. In any case, such a mode of thought could gain no wider field among the Jewish people; hence we find it disseminated indeed among the higher classes, since Sadducees sat not merely in the high Council, but also frequently on the throne of the High Priest; but the party could not be compared in point of the influence it exercised upon the people with that of the Pharisees, though with its cold and stately moral strictness it was as calculated as the other, with its hypocritical piety seeking its reward, to produce a new birth of the Israelitish people.

All deep religious and moral powers, or what was left of them in the ancient people of God, appear at that time to have taken refuge rather in the society of the Essenes,* of which

* Josephus treats of the Essenes in particular, "Jewish War," ii. 8, 2—13, Antiq. xviii. 1, 5; Philo, in the essay, *Quod omnis probus liber*, and of the

we find no mention in the most ancient records of Christianity, probably because the tenets of the sect bordered too closely upon those of the Christians. It may indeed have been only a strange confusion on the part of the Father of Church History, when he took the Egyptian branch (or tribe) of the Essenes, the so-called Therapeuts, for regular Christians.* Still, the connection between this sect and Christendom in its most ancient form is so close, that it has always given cause for reflection. On both sides there is a similar constitution of society, with community of goods and elected rulers, rejection of oaths, respect for poverty and celibacy, holy washings and meal times, combined indeed among the Essenes with a strong ascetic colouring, *e.g.* instead of wine at their common meals only water, and an abstinence from meat as well as wine, while they satisfied their appetites with vegetable diet. Several of these traits remind us on the one hand of John the Baptist, who seems to have stood to the Essenes in the same relation as in the middle ages a Hermit did to the Monkish Orders; on the other hand, of James, so called the Just, whom the most ancient Christian writers describe exactly as an Essene saint,† and with whom is connected the old Jewish-Christian sect of the Ebionites, the affinity of whom with the Essenes is unmistakeable.

In the Essenes and Therapeuts we see a circle of Israelites who were dissatisfied with the traditional public exercise of religion of their people, kept themselves therefore at a distance from the national sacrificial service of the Temple, and had also withdrawn as much as possible from the polluting intercourse

Therapeuts in that *De vita contemplativa*. Compare, moreover, Gfrörer, the Sanctuary and the Truth, p. 355 ff.; Zeller, Philosophy of the Greeks, iii. 2, p. 583 ff., and the treatise on the connection between Essenism and the Grecian Element, Theological Annual, 1856, p. 401 ff.; Hilgenfeld, Jewish Apocalypics, p. 245 ff.; and the Question of the Gospels, Journal of Scientific Theology, 1862, p. 40 ff.; Baur, Christianity of the Three First Centuries, p. 19 ff.

* Eusebius, Church History, ii. 17.

† Hegesippus, quoted in Eusebius, Church History, ii. 23, 4 ff.

of men in general. The object of their union was to release the soul from the bonds of the body: to this abstinence from sensual pleasure the strict discipline of the order, which left only works of charity and love to the free judgment of the individual, was supposed to contribute. Besides this the society had various branches: together with the four degrees which were defined according to the time of their entering the society, Josephus distinguishes from the Essenes of strict observance those who lived in wedlock; and Philo, from the Egyptian Therapeuts who led a purely contemplative life devoted to study and pious contemplation, the Essenes of Palestine, who, notwithstanding their social life in accordance with the rules of their order, occupied themselves with agriculture and peaceful trades, and therefore, having more extensive contact with ordinary civil life, were especially adapted to spread the religious principles of the society beyond the exclusive circle of the order.

If we ask how it was that Judaism got a tendency so foreign to its general character, an explanation of the retirement of the Essenes from the world is offered by the necessity of the time, and a parallel to the Essene asceticism in the Jewish Nazarene system and the instances of abstinence of the later prophets; but a number of other characteristics in their mode of thought and life, especially their worship of the sun as a copy of the most Supreme Light, a practice objectionable from a Jewish point of view—the dualism between spirit and matter, which lay at the root of their asceticism—the view they took of the body as the prison of the soul in connection with the belief of the pre-existence of the latter—these and other characteristics evidently point beyond the province of Judaism. And the systemization in the constitution of the society, the year of probation which the candidate had to go through, the reverence for superiors, the obligation to silence which he undertook, the rejection of bloody sacrifices, the abstinence from meat and wine—all this leads us

to the Neo-Pythagoreans of that time, a school that arose out of the combination of Orphico-Pythagorean traditions with Platonic and Stoic speculation, in which we find all these characteristics, partly as legends of its founder and the league established by him, partly as real peculiarities of the so-called Pythagorean mode of life with which Josephus compares expressly that of the Essenes. The mode in which the mental tendency that grew up among the Greeks came to the Jews may be in some degree explained by the fact, already mentioned, that the sect, evidently the same, among the Egyptian Jews, is found again under the name of Therapeuts. For thus, especially when we learn that the Therapeuts lived principally in the district round Alexandria, the contact of the Jewish element with the Grecian, and the amalgamation of the one with the other, is at once explained; and considering the constant intercourse that took place between the Jews in Egypt and those in the mother country, the sect might easily be transplanted into the latter; unless we prefer to suppose that already in the time of the amalgamation and education and cultivation which took place under the Seleucidæ, the Orphico-Pythagorean system found an echo in Palestine, and this tendency was only strengthened and further developed by subsequent contact with the Egyptian Therapeuts.

A mode of thought connected with this had developed itself in the two last centuries before Christ, outside of the order, among the Alexandrian Jews; and the same individual who describes the culmination of the tendency, the Jew Philo, is one of our principal authorities for the knowledge of that order. These philosophising Jews in Alexandria had not indeed released themselves from the Mosaic forms of worship, and the sacred writings of their countrymen, the books of Moses in particular, were held in great honour among them; but, like the Essenes, they were adroit enough, on the side of those of their opinions which differed in many ways from

the doctrine of the books, to deal with the books allegorically. These differences especially relate to the conception of God, in so far as offence was taken at the human element in the mode in which the Old Testament represents the Deity,—the speaking, the hand, the wrath, the repentance, the rest and descent of God. The Divine nature was elevated above every finite condition and placed in an extra-mundane position, out of which he could operate upon the world only by descending power, by ministering agents. In this conception the Jewish doctrine of angels and the Platonic doctrine of ideas were united. So also in that of the Logos as the operating divine reason, in which all those mediating powers combine, the Jewish doctrine of the Spirit of God and the Wisdom of God on the one side, and the Stoic doctrine of the Divine Reason penetrating the world on the other, met together. Added to this was the Orphico-Platonic view of the body as a prison of the soul, culminating in an ecstatic contemplation of God. And it is upon the connection of this system with that of the Essenes that the admiration is founded which Philo paid to the Essenes and Therapeuts as described by him.

We may now consider what each of these tendencies, especially that of the three prevailing sects, had discovered with reference to the problem of the Jewish people alluded to above. In that of the Pharisees, the negative conclusion only had come out, that upon the road which they had taken God was not to be found, a satisfactory relation of man to him was not to be reached. But in so far as it was one side only of the original Hebrew religion, namely, the external service, the ritual and ceremonial element, which Pharisaism, in a one-sided way and separated from everything by which it was supplemented in the old Hebrew religion, had made its principle, the religious torpidity into which this tendency had brought the people, might serve as a proof that this was not the side of the religion in which lay its vivifying power, but rather that, the overgrowth of which might be fatal to it.

Even the hope of the Messiah, the political and exclusively Jewish form in which it was taken up by the Pharisees, shewed itself even then, and still more at a later period, by the mode in which it roused fanaticism among the people, and by the unhappy insurrection of which it was continually the occasion, most destructive of the true spirit of religion, equally dangerous also to the people themselves. It was necessary that the idea of God and the service of God, as well as that of the Messiah, should be apprehended in a totally different way, if it was to be of advantage to the nation and to humanity itself.

With regard to Sadduceeism, the accounts we have are too scanty to enable us to formularize so definitely the contributions which it made to the solution of the problem indicated above. The negative—the fact, as well as the cause of the fact, that the road entered upon by the Pharisaic party was not the right one—appears to have been clear to persons of this tendency. Still, nothing positive came out that they would have substituted for the opposite system; and the emphatic manner in which they exalted human free-will in opposition to divine predestination, the self-sufficiency of human virtue in opposition to the rewards of a future life, appears to point to a retrogression of the religious element as compared with the moral, and so to a point of view which must necessarily have isolated those standing upon it within the circle of Judaism.

Philo says of the Essenes, that they worship God, not by sacrificing beasts, but by endeavouring to make their state of mind an acceptable offering to God. And thus we see that in opposition to the road taken by the Pharisees, they entered upon another of their own, on the ground of religion itself. Josephus, indeed, expresses himself to the effect that it was not the state of mind simply in itself which in this sect took the place of the ceremonies prescribed in the law of Moses, but a similar system of external practices, as prayer, wash-

ing and chastisement, religious meals and festivals. Still, these practices were above all directed to the renunciation or restraint of sensual passion, or, as in the case of the worship of the sun and the light, the veil of symbolism was so thin that the spiritual and moral meaning appeared through it far more than in the case of the more material rules of worship given by Moses. On this side, therefore, in the case of the Essenes, the object which the prophets had already endeavoured to obtain, the worship of God by purity of heart and conduct, by righteousness and charity, was indeed realised in one respect; but in another, and that a twofold point of view, realised in an inadequate form. For, in the first place, it was connected with an asceticism and a ceremonial in which the illiberality of the whole system, the admixture of fanaticism with what was in itself right, betrayed itself; in the next place, it was confined to a secret confederacy, the main principle of which conceived it necessary to debar itself from the world in order to maintain its purity, whereas, on the contrary, genuine piety and morality is bound to preserve its power by entering into the world, and penetrating and sanctifying its relations with that world by its own spirit. And yet by this system something important was as it were all but attained. All not belonging to the league, consequently the ordinary Jews, were counted among the unclean, from contact with whom the Essenes kept aloof. Consequently, the former were declared not to be the true people of God in and by themselves alone, nor until they had taken a further step towards their purification. The immediate effect was, that the circle was made smaller than before, for there is no trace of the admission of non-Jewish members into the Essene league; but still, at the same time, a blow was given to the national pride of the Jews, which prepared the way at a distance for the victory over Jewish exclusiveness.

29. DEVELOPMENT OF GRECO-ROMAN CULTIVATION.

In opposition to the religious tendency of the Jewish people, all the efforts of that of the Greeks* were applied to the perfecting of the really human element in man. This position does not, speaking generally, require any proof, as in politics and morals, in the poetry and fine arts of the people, it lies before us as a recognised fact. But in their religion it shews itself in the resemblance of the Greek gods to men. The Indian, the Egyptian, the Assyrian, did not shape their divinities in purely human form. And the cause of this was not merely deficiency in artistic skill and taste, but above all the fact that these nations did not conceive of their gods as being simply human. Whether the Greek obtained his divinities in part from abroad or from native predecessors, the peculiar change which he, as a Greek, in every instance set about making is this, that he converted the original *natural* symbolism into a relation to human life; made them, instead of types of cosmical powers, representatives of the powers of the human mind and social institutions, and in connection with this approximated their outward form more completely to the human.

Now a piety which produced human ideals in god-like forms—in those of an Apollo, an Athene, a Zeus—stands indisputably higher than that which had not divested its divinities externally of the form of beasts, and internally of the wild, creating or destroying power of Nature; but the human element in the Greek gods had corresponding to its original natural signification, as well as to the state of the cultivation of the popular mind at the time when these ima-

* Comp. for what follows, Zeller, *Philosophy of the Greeks* (second edition, 1856 ff.); *Development of Monotheism among the Greeks* (1862), by the same.

ginations were realized in form, together with its moral side, so strongly-marked a sensual side, that as soon as the moral ideas were enlightened, offence could not fail to be taken at the cruelties of a Kronos, the adulteries of a Zeus, the pilferings of a Hermes, &c. Hence the poets of the later period endeavoured to give a moral colouring to the myths that offended them; but there were individual philosophers of an earlier time, above all Xenophanes, the founder of the Eleatic school, who rejected the unworthy, and in general human, conceptions of the gods as they were represented by Homer and Hesiod; and, as is well known, it was on this ground that Plato banished Homer from his ideal republic. But even independently of this moral stumbling-block, the plurality of gods was soon discovered to be irreconcilable with the idea of the Divine nature, which, as the most perfect possible and the supreme cause of everything, could be only one and indivisible; and thus, among educated Greeks, we see Polytheism continually more and more displaced by the conception of Monotheism, or at all events reconciled with it by a stricter subordination of separate divinities to one supreme God. Thus in this respect the Greek gradually raised himself to the point of view on which the Hebrew stood from the first, and in so far as the former had attained to his conception of the one God by the philosophical method, that conception, in its later contact with Jewish Monotheism, might be of especial service to the latter in the way of purifying it from many anthropomorphic features which still clung to it in the writings of the Old Testament.

But in all this the Greek formed his conceptions of man, his nature and his duties, far in advance of those ideal gods in Homer, and in a manner that never would have been possible on Jewish soil. "Humanitarianism," says Welcker,* "could never have issued from Hebrew supranaturalism;

* Greek Mythology, i. 249.

“for in proportion as the apprehension is earnest and exalted
 “must the authority and the law of the one God and Lord
 “suppress that human religious freedom out of which all power
 “and cheerfulness is derived in the best and noblest form.”
 It was precisely because the Divinity did not confront the Greek in the form of a commanding law, that the Greek was compelled to be a law to himself; because he did not, like the Jew, see his whole life ordered for him, step by step, by religious ordinance, he was compelled to seek for a moral rule within his own mind. That this was a difficult problem, that the way to the solution of it led over dangerous ground, we see by the corruption of morals which broke in over the Greek nation after the most brilliant and flourishing age, by the arbitrary manner in which the contemporary Sophists confounded all moral notions. To them, according to the maxim of Protagoras, man was the measure of all things: nothing was naturally good or bad, but only by reason of an arbitrary rule of men, to which the individual need not bind himself; but as the authors of those rules established them for their own advantage, it was open to the individual to call good and put in practice whatever was agreeable or useful to himself. The art of justifying such conduct argumentatively, of shaking the foundations of all existing principles in religion and morals, “of strengthening the weaker cause,” *i.e.* of making right of wrong, was taught and published by the Sophists, but in point of fact all that they did was to put into a methodical form what all the world around them was practising already.

It is well known how this moral license among the people of the Greeks, and the sophistical palliation of it, was resisted by Socrates. He could not, like a Hebrew prophet, refer to a written law of God, which indeed in the case of his fellow-countrymen, long before moved to religious scepticism, would have done no good; like the opponents, therefore, whom he endeavoured to combat, he kept to man; to him

too, in a certain sense, man was the measure of all things; but not man in so far as he follows his own caprice or pleasure, but in so far as he seeks in earnest to know himself, and by well-regulated thought to come to an understanding with himself as to what contributes to his own true happiness. He who acts upon such true knowledge will on all occasions act right, and this right conduct will ever make man happy: this was the condensed substance of the moral system of Socrates, for the establishment of which he required no divine command; although he delivered very pure notions respecting the nature of God, in the sense of the reconciliation alluded to above of the national Polytheism with a rational Monotheism. That Socrates delivered these doctrines not scholastically in an exclusive circle, but publicly and as it were socially; that, moreover, as an exalted example, he at the same time practised what he taught in his own life and conduct; that, lastly, he became a martyr to his convictions, to his efforts, misunderstood by the mass of his fellow-citizens, for spiritual and moral elevation—all this gives him a resemblance to Christ which has always been observed: in fact, notwithstanding the wide difference occasioned by the opposition between the systems of the nations and the religions on both sides, there is not in the whole of antiquity previous to Christianity, that of the Hebrews not excepted, any figure to be found so closely resembling Christ as that of Socrates. After Socrates, no Greek did more to raise the tone of Greek cultivation to a point at which it might come into contact with the religion of the Hebrews, consequently towards the preparation for Christianity, than his disciple Plato. According to him, Ideas constituted all that was true in things, *i.e.* general notions of them, which he considered to be not mere conceptions in the minds of men, but real, supersensuous existences. The highest idea is that of the Good, and this was identical with God himself; and when Plato calls Ideas also Gods, we see in this the

possibility of a reconciliation of his philosophy on the one hand with the Polytheism of his countrymen, on the other with the Monotheism of the Jews; for Ideas which in the former case might be looked upon as subordinate Gods or Demons, might in the latter be looked upon as Angels, and be subordinated to the supreme Idea as to the one God. Plato declares the external world to have arisen from an amalgamation of reason with unreason, from the entrance of Ideas into their opposite (which accordingly was called matter, but which Plato described more negatively as the non-existent, without form and definiteness): in connection with this, in the language of the mysteries, he calls the human body the fetter and prison of the soul into which it sunk out of an earlier disembodied state of pure contemplation of Ideas, and he considers the utmost possible release of the soul from the body as the problem which philosophy has to solve. In all this we recognise at once the points of contact with the views of the Essenes and the Gnostic speculations in the form in which they appeared early in the Christian Church: but the main central principle, that of considering not the visible but the invisible as the truly Existent, not this life but the future as the true Life, has so much connection with Christianity, that we cannot but recognise in this principle a preparation for it, or of mankind for it, on the part of the Greeks. Lastly, Plato does not, as Socrates did, consider virtue as the only true means for attaining happiness, but makes happiness to consist in virtue as the right condition, harmony and health of the soul, and in so doing he makes virtue, in so far as it has its reward in itself, independent of all impure motives, even of a regard to future recompence, which, nevertheless, he emphatically inculcates. Thus he raised the idea of virtue as much above the Christian idea of it, as the point of view of the genuine philosopher is as compared with the ordinary religious point of view, and only the foremost of the Christian teachers have in this respect come near to Plato.

In everything that was essential, Aristotle remained true to Plato's exalted theory of man's moral object, only that, in accordance with his tendency to outward experience, he laid more stress upon external good and evil as possible helps or obstacles to moral effort. The school of the Stoics, in part from a motive of mere opposition to the less strict principles of the Peripatetic school founded by Aristotle, took as the main foundation of their moral doctrine the self-sufficiency of virtue, its power to make men happy in itself alone, the worthlessness of everything external to it. According to the Stoic doctrine, virtue is to be considered the only good, vice the only evil; all other things, however powerful their influence may be on the condition of men, come into the category of the indifferent; health and sickness, riches and poverty, nay, life and death themselves, are in themselves neither good nor bad, but solely indifferent things, which men may turn as well to good as to evil. Here the connection with the later Christian point of view and its indifference to external circumstances cannot be overlooked; and when the Stoic philosophy places its wise man, as a being perfect, absolutely without wants and godlike, upon an elevation apparently irreconcilable with Christian humility, this elevation is again compensated when the superiority of the wise man is stated to consist only in his having put himself in accordance with the law of the universe, and adapted himself to the general reason of the world; and resignation to destiny as the will of God, the subordination of the individual will to the will of the Divinity, is preached by the Stoics in a manner which at once reminds us of the precepts of Christ.

Again, there was still another point of view in which Stoicism prepared the way for Christianity. The mode of thought that prevailed in antiquity, not merely among the Jews, but also among the Greeks and Romans, was, in accordance with the isolation of the nations before the great monarchies of the world arose, exclusive, and limited to their

own people. The Jew considered none but the posterity of Abraham to be the people of God; the Greek held that none but a Hellene was a genuine man, or fully entitled to be called a man at all; and with reference to the barbarian he assigned himself the same exclusive position that the Jew did to himself towards the Gentiles. Even philosophers like Plato and Aristotle had not yet quite rid themselves of the national prejudice; the Stoics were the first to draw from the community of the faculty of reason in all men, the inference of the essential resemblance and connection of all.

The Stoics were the first to look upon all men as citizens of a great republic, to which all individual states stand in only the same relation as the houses of the town to the whole, as a family under the common law of reason; the idea of Cosmopolitanism, as one of the finest fruits of the exertions of Alexander the Great, first sprung up in the Porch; nay, a Stoic was the first to speak the word that all men are brothers, all having God for their Father. As regards the idea of God, the Stoics advanced the reconciliation between the popular polytheism and philosophical monotheism on the ground of the pantheistic view of the Universe, so far as to consider Zeus as the universal spirit of the Universe, the original existence, and the other gods as portions and manifestations of him; and in so doing they did, in the idea of the Logos, describing universal Reason as the creative power of nature, prepare a conception which was afterwards to become of the utmost importance for the dogmatic foundation of Christianity. At the same time, by the allegorical interpretation which they applied to Homer and Hesiod in order to extract physio-philosophical ideas out of the gods and their histories in the Greek mythology, the Stoics pointed out to the Alexandrian Jews, and subsequently to the Christians, in the study of the Old, and subsequently of the New Testament, the way of substituting at their pleasure a different meaning when they did not like the literal one.

However far a theory which places the highest good in pleasure, and deprives the gods of all interference with the world and mankind, appears to be removed from the line of spiritual development which helped to prepare the way for Christianity, still, even in Epicureanism, traits are not wanting that bear some resemblance to it. In the first place, it is especially true in philosophy that the most opposite tendencies come in contact when thoroughly carried out, and thus the highest Good of the Epicurean is not so far from that of the Stoic as might appear at first sight. For by that pleasure in which he places the highest Good, the Epicurean does not understand the highest sensual enjoyment, but an abiding tranquil state of mind, which requires the renunciation of much transitory enjoyment, the acceptance of much incidental pain; and the Epicurean tranquillity is closely connected with the Stoic apathy. It is true, indeed, that the virtue of the Epicurean is never an object in and for itself, nor ever anything as a means for attaining that happiness which is separate from it, but still the means are so indispensable and so sufficient, that he can neither conceive virtue without happiness nor happiness without virtue. And though the Epicureans were not so prudish as the Stoics with regard to the outward good things of life, still they pointed to the simplicity of men's real wants, and to the advantage of keeping within the bounds of these wants, conversely also to the mode in which pain and misery may be conquered by the exercise of reason and coolness. In this the Epicureans, by their passive process, approached very nearly to the same point as the Stoics did by their active, and towards the latter they stood in a supplementary relation in those points in which Stoic severity became harshness and want of feeling. The Porch would know nothing of compassion and indulgence; Epicurus advised mercy and pardon; and the Epicurean principle, that it is better to confer a benefit than to receive one, corresponds exactly to the precept of Jesus, that to give is more blessed than to receive.

It was from the opposition and combat between these schools of Greek philosophy, of which the one regularly denied what the other maintained, the one thought it could refute what the other thought it could maintain, that at last a doubt of all truth as capable of being known and proved, Scepticism, as well philosophical as practical, developed itself. In this there seems at first sight to be a still wider separation from popular religious faith than had been before involved in men's applying themselves to philosophy. Still the breaking of the last supports which human consciousness sought in philosophy might make that consciousness even more ready to receive a fresh supposed revelation of the Divine. The increase of superstition, the recourse to secret mysteries and novel forms of worship, which were to bring man into immediate contact with the Divinity, such as may be noticed about the time of the rise of Christianity even among the more cultivated classes of the Greco-Roman world, was the result of the fact that not merely the old Religions now failed to give mankind the satisfaction which they sought for, but the existing philosophical systems also failed to do so. It is well known how in the third century after Christ the so-called Neo-Platonic philosophy sprang out of this unsatisfied want; but even in the last century before Christ we remark a precedent to this tendency in the same Neo-Pythagoreism to which we ascribed above an influence upon the Therapeutico-Essenic sect among the Jews. If then such a want of a new method of contact with the Divine, a new bond between Heaven and Earth, was felt in the spirit of that time, and felt among the Jews as well as among the Gentiles, Christianity takes its place as one of a series of attempts to satisfy that want, and the recognition that it met with is explained from the fact that it had the power of satisfying it in a more catholic and original manner than the artificially invented systems of Neo-Pythagoreism and Neo-Platonism, or the secret league of the Therapists and Essenes.

If now, as compared with what the Greeks did to prepare the way for Christianity, we attempt to describe the assistance which the Roman people rendered, we may refer this assistance to two points. The first is, the unity of one great Empire within which, even in the century before the birth of Christ, they had comprised all the known nations of the ancient world. In this Alexander had preceded them; but his kingdom, which besides did not comprise the real West, had not continued to exist as a unity, but had fallen into several pieces, among which there was never a complete cessation from a bloody struggle. It was impossible that the idea of Cosmopolitanism, the contemplation of man as man, and no longer merely as Greek, Jew, &c. &c., could strike deep root until it did so in the Roman Empire of the world; so also it was necessary for the numerous and separate divinities of tribes and nations to unite and mix in this great communion of peoples, before the conceptions of them could resolve themselves into that of the one supreme and only God, the religions of the nations into a religion of the world. And with this change the spiritualization of religion was immediately connected. The One God could not be a material God, and for the God of all nations the usages were no longer suited by which this or that people had been accustomed to worship its own God. Christianity having once arisen, was enabled to spread rapidly and unimpeded by means of the closer connection which the Roman rule had established by assimilation of education and institutions, as well as by the facilitation of intercourse between separate nations and countries. This dissemination was but an external addition to all that preceded. The reverse side of this unity is the destruction of the happiness and comfort which each one of these peoples had before enjoyed in its independence, in living according to its own laws and ancient traditions, the pressure with which the foreign yoke weighed upon them, the manifold acts of injustice to which in the later times of

the Roman republic, especially during the civil war, they were obliged to submit. Men's life in this world being thus embittered, and all natural assistance against Roman oppression being at last despaired of, their minds were directed to the next world, their expectations to some miraculous succour such as that of the idea of the Jewish Messiah made them hope for, and Christianity promised after a spiritual fashion.

The other point which we may look upon as the Roman contribution towards the preparation of the way for Christianity, is the practical turn of the Roman people. Even the late schools of Greek philosophy, such as the Stoic and Epicurean, had preferred applying themselves to the theory of morals, and in the hands of the Romans, who had little inclination for mere speculation or scholastic philosophising generally, philosophy became entirely practical and popular. In the popular apprehension, the opposition between different schools and systems was smoothed away. The consequence was, that among the Romans especially was formed that Eclecticism, as the most famous representative of which Cicero is well known to all the world, though his real merit and importance in the history of progress has been lately overlooked. Seneca also, though he stands on Stoic ground, was not free from this Eclecticism; and in the writings of both there are found, about the One God and the consciousness of him implanted in men, as well as about man, his divine nature, its corruption and restoration, thoughts and expressions, the purity of which surprises us, while their resemblance to the doctrines of Christianity, especially in the case of Seneca, has given occasion to the legend of a connection between him and the Apostle Paul; while it only shews how everything on all sides at that time was pressing towards the point on which we see Christianity immediately appear.

30. THE BAPTIST.

When, after these preparatory considerations, we attempt to approach nearer to the Person of Him for whom it was reserved to pronounce the word which was to solve the riddle of the struggling time, we are met half-way by John the Baptist, whom the New Testament on the one side represents as the forerunner of Jesus, on the other side as more than a Prophet (Matt. xi. 9), *i.e.* as that personage in whom were combined all the best elements that Judaism, in its present state of development, had reached. And having said above that all the most profoundly religious and the strongest moral forces which still remained in the ancient people of God appear to have taken refuge in the order of the Essenes, we may now say that John shews so close a connection with what we know of the peculiarity of this order, that we cannot avoid being continually tempted to take the two together, and to consider first Essenism and then the Baptist as the media through which Christianity developed itself out of Judaism.

John the Baptist appears in the wilderness of Judea (Matt. iii. 1), that region west of the Dead Sea where the Essenes had numerous settlements; he lives on locusts and wild honey (Matt. iii. 4), as the Essenes satisfied their appetite with the simplest food; and the baptism by water, which he practised, likewise reminds us of the sacred ablutions on which the Essenes set so high a value. As to his clothing indeed, made from camels' hair, and the leathern girdle around his loins (Matt. iii. 4), we are not quite certain whether, when it had once become customary among Christians to consider him as a second Elijah, his costume also would not be copied from that of this ancient prophet, as it is described 2 Kings i. 8; meanwhile, a generation later, during the boyhood of the Jewish historian Josephus, in Banus, the hermit of the

wilderness, who clothed himself with bark of trees, lived on the raw products of nature, and bathed day and night in cold water, we are met by a phenomenon exactly similar, and, like John, connected with Essenism.* The narrative indeed of the birth and earliest years of the Baptist, as we find it in the introduction to the Gospel of Luke, describes his ascetic mode of life, his abstinence from wine and spirituous liquors, only as an ordinary Jewish Nazarite vow; but as his baptism to repentance appears to be one of those purifications of which Josephus tells us that the Essenes considered them preferable to the sacrifices of the law, so also his speech about the stones from which, if necessary, God could raise up children to Abraham (Matt. iii. 9), is quite in the spirit of the Essenes, who likewise considered the Israelite in and for himself, in so far as he did not adopt the sanctifying exercises of the Order, as always impure and unclean.

The substance of what John inculcated upon the crowds who gathered round him was comprised by Matthew (iii. 2), agreeing with the two other Synoptics, in the formula, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The first half of this exhortation, in Luke (iii. 10—15) is applied to the different classes of the people in a series of special exhortations, which extend to honesty and humanity, mercy and sympathy; but in Matthew (iii. 7 ff.) the two dominant sects of the Pharisees and Sadducees appear as the principal opposing power against which the preaching of the Baptist, and at a later period the ministry of Jesus, was directed. Their coming to his baptism is considered by the stern preacher of repentance as a sort of trick, of which the object was to escape the Divine vengeance that threatened them by a merely external practice; but that this would not succeed without a change of the inward mind proved by moral fruits, and that in particular, also, their boasted descent from

* Josephus, Vita, 2.

Abraham would not help them in the least. John, therefore, required of those whom he baptized a confession of their sins; and, following upon this, the baptism in the river was a type that, on the part of God, these were now to be forgiven, and also, on the part of men, that they were to be put away and not repeated. It is probable that the standpoint of the Baptist was thus understood, in the spirit of the West, too rationally, as there is no doubt that, in the spirit of the Essenes, he at the same time ascribed to the water a mysteriously purifying and absolving power. The description which Josephus gives of the ministry of John, though, intended as it is for Greek and Roman readers, it sounds very different, coincides nevertheless in essential points with these evangelical accounts.* The Jewish historian says that John was a bold man, and directed the Jews to unite together by baptism, in the practice of virtue, in justice to one another, and in piety towards God; for that this ablution will only be pleasing to Him if they avail themselves of it, not for the purpose of getting rid of individual blemishes (*i.e.* Levitical defilements), but for the sanctification of the body, the soul also having been before purified by righteousness. Even from this description it is plain how John, while on the one hand, in harmony with Essenism, he opposed his baptism to the Levitical washings, did on the other exactly the same as Jesus subsequently, passing from the external to the internal, from bodily cleansing to the purification of the mind, and perhaps for just this reason substituting in the place of frequent ablutions corresponding to particular external pollutions, baptism once for all as a type of the necessity of renewing the disposition once for all.

The reason for its being high time to obey this exhortation to repentance, is contained in the second half of the formula, in which Matthew comprises the substance of John's preach-

* Antiquities, xviii. 5, 2.

ing: his hearers are to repent, for the kingdom of heaven has come near. For those by whom, like the Pharisees, this exhortation was either not followed at all or only in appearance, this kingdom brought a terrible punishment (Matt. iii. 7; Luke iii. 7); they were indeed the chaff which the Messiah, appearing with his winnowing fan, would separate from the wheat and burn up, the unfruitful tree which he would cut down and throw into the fire (Matt. iii. 10, 12; Luke iii. 9, 17). Already some among the Prophets, as we saw above, had spoken of a purifying of the people as in the refiner's fire (Zech. xiii. 9; Mal. iii. 1 ff.), which Jehovah himself, or the messenger going before him, would undertake; as only those who were worthy were to share the blessedness of the better Messianic future, while those who were obstinately unworthy must be first swept away by a divine execution of judgment. The more righteous who now consented to be baptized by John with water, and proved their repentance in their life, were afterwards to be baptized by the Messiah on his appearance with the Holy Spirit (Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16), as an outpouring of the Holy Spirit at the time of the Messiah had been likewise already prophesied by the Prophets (Joel iii. 1 ff.).

Of this Messianic turn, the second part of the preaching of John, Josephus makes no express mention; but they who are acquainted with his manner of throwing into the background, suspected as it was by the Romans, this whole department of the conceptions and yearnings of his fellow-countrymen, will be able to observe it between his lines. If the expression that John called upon the Jews to combine together by means of baptism, alludes only indefinitely to a league and a confederacy, still the crowding together of the people, of which Josephus speaks as an effect of the preaching of John, and the fear of innovation and revolt, which according to him was Herod's motive for the beheading of the Baptist, point unmistakeably to the conclusion that the

idea of the Messiah, that inexhaustible source of Jewish insurrections, was not foreign to his preaching. It is not necessary that he himself should have apprehended it politically; he might have been misunderstood, as Jesus was afterwards misunderstood; but the call to moral conversion as a condition, does not exclude the expectation of a political redemption also by Jehovah, in case that condition were fulfilled.

John might think that he could gather from the signs of the times that the arrival of the expected Deliverer, and also Judge, could not be long delayed; he might also suppose that, after the manner of the ancient prophets, he had a divine call, though the turn which Luke gives to the circumstance, together with the list of governors which he brings forward (iii. 1 ff.), seems to be imitated from the introduction to the prophecies of Jeremiah. But that by the Messiah, whose near approach he proclaimed, the Baptist definitely understood the person of Jesus, as the Evangelists represent, is a supposition natural indeed from the Christian point of view, but so far from having any historical foundation, that it stands in direct contradiction to definite historical facts. If he recognised Jesus as the Messiah, then it was his duty, I will not say at once to discontinue his preaching and his baptism, which he might consider to be still desirable for the preparation of the masses, but at all events to refer those whom he baptized to Jesus as one from whom they would have to receive further instruction. Instead of this, according to the synoptic Gospels, while still in prison he sends two disciples to Jesus, by no means with directions to attach themselves to him, but with a question which shews that he was anything but clear about his Messiahship (Matt. xi. 2 ff.; Luke vii. 18 ff.). And in the fourth Gospel, where he does indeed by his speeches about Jesus cause some of his disciples to attach themselves to him, he by no means does this with all, but works on with Jesus as being himself

the head of a school (iii. 23 ff.), the traces of which we find not only in the synoptic Gospels, but also in the Acts of the Apostles (Mark ix. 14; Mark ii. 18; Luke v. 33; Acts xviii. 24 ff., xix. 1 ff.). And this school continued, in accordance with his example and his arrangement of it, in forms which were very different from those which Jesus introduced among his own followers. The disciples of John had, in common with the Pharisees, the custom of frequent fasts (Matt. ix. 14), to which Jesus, if only on account of Pharisaic error which was connected with them, had an objection, and which moreover he reckoned among the forms of an outward religious system, to put an end to which he considered himself called. And the relation of these two personages to one another in their mode of life had corresponded to this. John, by his abstinence from eating and drinking, *i.e.* by the ascetic strictness of his conduct, had excited as much scandal and ill report as Jesus by the opposite; the former had done this as much by his gloomy isolation, as the latter by his cheerful intercourse with men of every class (Matt. xi. 18 ff.; Luke vii. 33 ff.). Now it is not the least probable that the man whose range of view was so much narrower, who was still plunged so deep in ascetic prejudices, should have acknowledged one who had thrown aside all these prejudices as his superior, or as him whom he had come to announce. The Baptist, although traces are wanting of his external connection with the order of the Essenes, appears nevertheless as a genuine Essene both in what he did and what he did not do. Jesus, after having appropriated all that was true and good in the ideas and aims of the Essenic order, abandoned everything in the system that was narrow and illiberal, and so might appear to John quite as much in the character of a degenerate Disciple as of a superior Master.

31. JESUS. HIS EXTRACTION.

To this John, when baptizing on the lower Jordan, all the Evangelists represent Jesus as coming and submitting to his baptism. History cannot take up the thread of the life of Jesus before this point. Out of the tissue of legends referring to his infancy and youth, only two or three points can be adopted as historical. We reserve, therefore, for a subsequent investigation the task of disentangling the threads of this tissue.

The first point is, that Jesus came from Galilee, from the little town of Nazareth. All his life he is called a Nazarene, a Galilean (Matt. xxvi. 69, 71; Mark i. 24, xiv. 67; Luke xviii. 37; John i. 46, vii. 41, xix. 20), and even after his death the latter continued to be his regular appellation (Luke xxiv. 19; Acts ii. 22, iii. 6, iv. 10, vi. 14, xxii. 8, xxvi. 9), and it also passed over to his followers (Acts xxiv. 5). Matthew and Luke represent him as having been brought up in Nazareth, they declare his birth-place to have been Bethlehem in Judea (Matt. ii. 1, 22 ff.; Luke ii. 4, 39, iv. 16). But the opposite hypothesis as to the original dwelling-place of his parents from which these Evangelists start in the accounts they give, shews that they are not following any historical authority, but simply a dogmatic conclusion drawn from the passage in the prophet Micah, v. 1.

As to the next point, there is every probability that the father of Jesus was a carpenter, and belonged, accordingly, to the lower classes of society. According to the Gospel, he was called among his fellow-townsmen of Nazareth the carpenter's son, and even the carpenter (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 15); and the fact that Justin Martyr* ascribes to his occupation as a carpenter with ploughs and yokes or balance beams, an allegorical allusion to righteousness and industry,

* Dial. c. Tryph. Jud. 88.

of which there is no trace in the New Testament, is not sufficient to warrant our considering this particular of his history as having been invented. Even the names of his two parents, Joseph and Mary, especially the latter, occur in the New Testament too often to allow of our supposing them to be anything but a genuine residue of historical information. From the circumstance that in the history of the life of Jesus to the end, nay, even after his death, his mother appears to be living (Matt. xii. 47; John xix. 25; Acts i. 14), while Joseph never comes upon the scene after the history of the Infancy, it seems to follow that the father either died early, or had nothing to do with the subsequent ministry of his son. But it is not improbable that on dogmatic grounds the person, who was not supposed to be the real father of Jesus, was removed from the tradition about him.

Of the other domestic relations of Jesus, we learn that he had both brothers and sisters (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3). Of his brothers, the names of Jacob, Joses, Simon and Judas, are given to us; of his sisters, it is only said that at the time of Jesus' public ministry they were still living in Nazareth. The circumstance that Jesus on one occasion, on being told that his mother and his brethren are standing outside and wish to speak to him, is stated to have said: "Who are my mother and my brethren?" and, pointing to his disciples, to have added, that they were his mother and his brethren who hear his word and follow it, or who do the will of his Father who is in heaven (Matt. xii. 46 ff.; Mark iii. 32 ff.; Luke viii. 19 ff.), does not in and by itself prove the existence of any estrangement between him and his family; at any rate, it is only in Mark that it is combined with the uncourteous turn given to it, implying that the relations of Jesus, on the occasion of their visit to him, intended to get possession of his person, believing him to be out of his mind (iii. 21). But John says plainly that even his brethren did not believe in him (vii. 5). And though it was indeed connected with the

esoteric tendency of this Gospel to set aside the real brothers of Jesus as unbelieving, in order to enable the writer to transfer, under the very cross, the place of the true son of Mary, the spiritual brother of Jesus, to the favourite disciple, still, considering the great importance which, soon after the death of Jesus, James, the so-called brother of the Lord, obtained, this person would certainly have been in some way distinguished in our synoptic Gospels, had it not been notorious that at that time, at least, he did not belong to the more contracted circle of the followers of Jesus. After his death, on the contrary, his brothers, with the Apostles and his mother, appear as the nucleus of the Church (Acts i. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5); and the above-named James, in particular, as one of the three pillars, nay, even as the proper head of the Church of Jerusalem (Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, 12; comp. Acts xv. 13, xxi. 18). The tendencies of this James were, according to the notices of him by the Apostle Paul, strictly Judaistic, and in ecclesiastical tradition he is represented as having lived, as already mentioned, as a perfect Essenico-Ebionitish saint, in his ascetic conduct more resembling John the Baptist than Jesus. The probability that he was not the real brother, but only a cousin of Jesus, has been attempted to be made out from the fact that the names of James and Joses, which the Nazarenes give as the names of two brothers of Jesus, are stated elsewhere by Matthew (xxvii. 56) to be those of two sons of another Mary, who is taken to be the same person as John (xix. 25) designates as the sister of the mother of Jesus.

Now it is indeed true that in Biblical language a mere cousin is called a brother; but that it should be done in the case of these persons with reference to Jesus without what is assumed to have been the more accurate description being once stated, and that they should be brought forward repeatedly in the immediate company of the mother of Jesus—all this leaves the less probability in favour of this supposition,

the greater the suspicion is that it arose from dogmatical prejudice.

The authors of the two genealogies in Matthew and Luke considered the brothers of Jesus as at all events only half-brothers, *i.e.* brothers only on the mother's side, as in the case of Jesus they assumed the operation of the Holy Spirit in the place of that of Joseph. But we here entirely discard all that is found in the Gospels relating to the supernatural extraction of Jesus, as we are now dealing only with historical masses, and we cannot admit as historical anything that is said of his pedigree from David. For this stands upon exactly the same footing as his birth at Bethlehem. It rests upon the dogmatic conclusion drawn from what was expected of the Messiah, upon what must have been the case with Jesus, assumed to be the Messiah; while, on the other hand, it is historically doubtful in consequence of the contradiction between the two genealogies (Matt. i. 1 ff.; Luke iii. 23 ff.), and besides from the almost ironical expression of Jesus respecting the conception of the Messiah as the son of David (Matt. xxii. 41). The descent of Jesus from David has been supposed to explain more easily the growth of the Messianic consciousness within him. We shall find, on the contrary, that the turn which he gave to the Messianic idea, differing as it did from the ordinary theory, is much more easily explained on the supposition that he did not look upon himself as being, according to the flesh, a descendant of David.

32. EDUCATION OF JESUS. HIS RELATION TO JOHN THE BAPTIST.

With regard to the means of mental and spiritual development at the disposal of Jesus during the years of his preparation, we learn scarcely anything from the sources we possess. Even Luke, with his story of the appearance of the child of

twelve years old among the Doctors in the Temple at Jerusalem (ii. 41 ff.), does not in the least pretend to say that he learnt anything from these men, but, on the contrary, that the young Theodidact was able, even at that early age, to give some advice to the most learned among the heads of his countrymen. The narrative, however, as being only the result of a dogmatic assumption, appears to be without historical value. The statement also made on the occasion of this event, that his parents journeyed every year to the pass-over at Jerusalem, only serves in part to introduce the scene with the Doctors in the Temple, partly in harmony with the whole history of the infancy in Luke, to bring into relief the pious conduct, in accordance with the law, of the parents of Jesus.

Nothing is said in the Gospels of any regular education enjoyed by Jesus. We might attribute their silence on this point to their endeavour, on dogmatic grounds, to represent him as one taught by none but God, and so we might incline to the supposition that he did receive such an education, especially—even though we may suppose him in his early years to have assisted at his father's trade—especially, we say, as such a course did not, according to Jewish customs, as we know from the instance of the Apostle Paul (Acts xviii. 3, xxii. 3), exclude a learned career. On the other side, however, the title of Rabbi or Doctor, which others as well as disciples, and even Scribes, gave to Jesus, is no proof that Jesus had had this education. For that title, when once a person had practically gained a position as a teacher, was not construed very accurately. And in the doctrine and style of teaching of Jesus there is nothing, supposing the existence of a certain amount of ability, not capable of being fully explained on the supposition of laborious study of the Old Testament, and on that of free social intercourse with his learned countrymen, especially those belonging to the three prevailing schools. On the other hand, the originality, fresh-

ness, and absence of all that pedantry which is so observable in the highly-gifted Apostle of the Gentiles, makes an independent development more probable in the case of Jesus. And to such a development his Galilean extraction was particularly favourable. We know of this region that its population, especially in the northern parts, was much mixed with Gentiles, and on this account this division of it was even called Galilee of the Gentiles (Mark iv. 15; after Isaiah viii. 23); and as besides this the province was separated by the intervening Samaria from that of Judea, so proud of its faith, the Galileans were contemptuously despised and not considered as entitled to the full privileges of Jews; and even these circumstances might aid in the development of a more liberal religious tendency.

The relation also to John the Baptist, into which, according to Luke (iii. 23), Jesus appears to have entered not long before his thirtieth year, is not represented by the Evangelists as of such a nature as to have had influence upon his mental development. According to them, John had only to baptize Jesus and to make him known as the Messiah; nay, they give an account of circumstances with which on our historical standpoint we cannot deal, but to which we shall return subsequently in connection with another investigation. But to do on this account what has been lately done, to reject as unhistorical even the simple statement that Jesus was baptized by John, appears to us going too far. Because, a hundred years later, the expectation was spread among the Jews that Elijah, who, in accordance with Malachi, was looked upon as the forerunner of the Messiah, would introduce the latter into his ministry by anointing him, it does not therefore follow that the history of the baptism was invented solely on account of this expectation; looking at the question in itself, it is impossible to see sufficient cause for rejecting this account, and so cutting a thread which helps us to derive the appearance and ministry of Jesus from an antecedent.

It was natural for Jesus to be induced to undertake the journey to the Jordan by what he heard of the Baptist, since he also was not satisfied with the existing system of religion; in him also the yearning for something better had become vivid and powerful, and, as we see from his subsequent acts, the way to moral conversion to which John pointed, appeared to him also to be the only right one. He submitted to the ceremony of submersion in the river; and in this was symbolically exhibited that confession of sins which John required of the candidates for baptism (Matt. iii. 6; Mark i. 5); and the different turn to the circumstance which the Evangelists give, is only the consequence of dogmatic reflection, and has no historical importance. Neither, provided we do not start from the assumption, so fatal to all historical consideration, of the sinlessness of Jesus, does it give rise to the slightest difficulty, since even the best and purest of mankind has ever many sins to accuse himself of, much remissness, much precipitation; moreover, as the individual becomes morally purified, the moral feeling itself is more acutely sensitive of the slightest impurity of moral motives, of the slightest deviation from the moral ideal. Indeed, Jesus himself, in answer to the rich young man who addressed him with the words "Good Master," expressly repudiated this epithet as one belonging to God alone (Mark x. 17 ff.; Luke xviii. 18 ff.).

A continuance in the retinue of the Baptist is by no means to be assumed of all those who submitted to his baptism, as crowds went through this ceremony who, after the pilgrimage to the new Prophet, again returned into their social relations; but we see from the unanimous accounts of the Gospel that a nucleus of regular disciples gathered round him as they did later round Jesus, and the question now is, whether we are to suppose Jesus also to have continued for a time in the retinue of the Baptist. The silence of the Evangelists proves nothing to the contrary, as they avoided, on dogmatic grounds, every appearance of even a transient subordination of Jesus

to the Baptist; but in and for itself there is every probability that he, though bound by no domestic or social ties, may have made a more than merely transitory use of closer intercourse with so important a man, inspired with an aim so closely connected with his own. It must be self-evident from the human and natural point on which alone we stand, that even as regards his future calling as a teacher of the people, to say nothing of the powerful moral influence which John exercised, Jesus might have learnt much from him; at the same time, he must have been becoming continually more and more conscious of what, in the Baptist, he did not agree with, of the essential difference which existed, if not between the objects which they had in view, at all events with regard to the means by which each of them thought those objects could be most easily attained.

The object of each was the moral and religious elevation of his nation, the formation of a society which could boast of more important privileges than the mere descent from Abraham, and which would be worthy to receive the Messiah who was expected to appear. But the Baptist, according to the account of Matthew in particular, hoped to attain this end chiefly by the way of severe denunciation, of threats of Divine vengeance. With this method Jesus could not have agreed, according to the whole character of his mind. However much, when required, the language of vengeance was at his command, still the method of love and mercy was more to his mind; he felt himself inspired by a spirit different from that of Elijah, with whom the Baptist was compared by his contemporaries and himself (Luke ix. 54 ff.; comp. i. 17; Matt. xvii. 12 ff.). Closely connected with this is another point. The Baptist, as we have seen, considered as requisite for the purpose of the sanctification, the elevation of his people out of the moral corruption in which they were plunged, all sorts of bodily mortifications, and in particular frequent fasting and abstinence from wine and the pleasures of this world.

Compared with the system of the Levitical law, such asceticism could only appear to Jesus as another mode of formalizing religion, a new danger of wandering away from the moral object; and it was also impossible that he should regard the gloomy, troubled spirit which such asceticism brings with it as requisite for the growth of the moral life. It cannot now be shewn how far each took a different view of the final object of their efforts, namely, that salvation by the Messiah, of which repentance was to be the condition; it is, however, most probable that in this also the difference between the systems of each was observable.

The tradition followed by Matthew (iv. 12) connects the public appearance of Jesus with the imprisonment of the Baptist; whether correctly or not we cannot, indeed, now decide; but it certainly is not the contradiction given in the fourth Gospel which need make that account uncertain. For when the author of this Gospel, after having represented Jesus as having already appeared on different occasions in Galilee and Jerusalem, expressly remarks (iii. 24), that at that time John had not yet been imprisoned, he must certainly have still been at large in order to have been able so voluntarily, as he afterwards does, to lay down his arms at the feet of Jesus; but as this is as improbable as it is required by the whole plan of the fourth Gospel, it is probable that that account is not historical. The same holds also of the notice which the Evangelist himself soon after half retracts, to the effect that Jesus, even during his lifetime, borrowed the rite of baptism from the Baptist (iii. 22; comp. iv. 1 ff.). The other Evangelists represent him as not instituting this usage until after his resurrection (Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 16), which gives probability to the assumption that this adoption of the practice of baptism did not take place in the most ancient Church until after the death of Jesus, but was, like so many rites that followed it, considered an institution of Jesus himself.

The account of Matthew, who represents Jesus as coming forward, though in a different region, when the Baptist retires, is supported by the fact that from the first he comprises the substance of the preaching of Jesus exactly in the same words in which he had given the substance of that of John, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (iv. 17, comp. with iii. 2). Both taken together, it would seem that Jesus only wished to take the place of John; but we may particularly observe that there is not implied in these words, any more than in the same words of the Baptist, a claim on the part of the speaker to be himself the promised Messiah. Again, in the history which follows of the call of the two disciples (Matt. iv. 18 ff.), Jesus appears only as a Prophet; higher than this the miracles of all kinds which he afterwards performs (Matt. vii. 9, 11) do not place him in the eyes of the people; the demons indeed blurt out the secret of his Messiahship (Matt. viii. 29), but are rebuked by him into silence (Mark i. 25—34). The healing of the demoniac, who is also blind and dumb, and the walking of Jesus on the sea, suggest also to the bystanders the thought that he must be the Messiah (Matt. xii. 23, xiv. 33); but this cannot have become at that time an abiding conviction, if Jesus, at a later time, could still put to his disciples the question inquiring of them whom men take him for, and who they say he is (Matt. xvi. 13 ff.). The three first Evangelists agree in placing this narrative after the miracle of the Loaves and before the Transfiguration; moreover, the two first describe the district where the circumstance occurred accurately as that of Cæsarea Philippi; and again, in all of them it is followed by the first announcement of the passion, and soon after comes the departure of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem. All this, according to Baur's subtle observation, is an unmistakeable mark of a correct historical memorandum. Jesus therefore was all this time considered among the superstitious people to be indeed a Prophet, and even though they might suppose that

he must be one supernaturally risen from the dead, as Elijah, Jeremiah, or even the Baptist, who had been just before put to death, still only a precursor of the Messiah, not the Messiah himself; and even the disciples, if the answer which Peter gave to the question surprised Jesus as something novel, cannot have considered him as anything more, nor can he himself have declared himself to be anything more, for if he had told them long before that he was the Messiah, he could not have asked them now who they think he is. When, therefore, in our Gospels, so early as the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. vii. 21 ff.), the instructions to the disciples (x. 23 ff.), he declares himself to be the Messiah who was thereafter to return to judge the world, those speeches and also the cases in which, as above mentioned, demoniacs and other persons already recognise him as the Messiah, even supposing that there is anything historical in them, must be placed too early in the history.

The question, however, still remains, Was it not until a later period that Jesus begun to consider himself as the Messiah? or had he indeed the conviction himself, but considered it well to reserve the declaration of it to his disciples and the people until later? We shall return to this question when we come to deal with the relation which Jesus assumed towards the idea of the Messiah entertained by his countrymen.

33. RELIGIOUS CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS. IMPOSSIBILITY OF DISCOVERING IT FROM THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

Schleiermacher well remarks in his lectures upon this subject, that it was not from the prophecies relating to the Messiah, or the conviction that he was the Messiah, that the peculiar self-consciousness of Jesus developed itself, but, conversely, that it was from his own self-consciousness that

he came to the conviction that in the Messianic prophecies no one could be meant but he ; that the consciousness, therefore, that he was the Messiah, was, looking at his general religious consciousness, not the first thing, but the second, not the original, but the derived consciousness. This observation, indeed, like everything else that he says relating to the person of Christ, was made by Schleiermacher entirely in a subjective, and not at all in a historical sense ; still it is a clever observation, and may also be verified historically.

"Once in his life," says Hase,* "Jesus must have taken "into consideration and overcome the theocratic hope of the "Messiah ;" but, we add, he certainly would have continued to entertain it, and would not have overcome it, if he had not, before he applied the idea of the Messiah to himself, brought to the consideration of that idea a fundamental religious view by which that idea must have been modified and divested of its material and national component elements. We may suppose that from external circumstances, from considering his descent, the expectations of the circle within which he had been born and bred, the circumstances and events of his youth, he had, even previously to the development of his religious consciousness, come to entertain the thought that he was the Messiah, and that it would therefore have been the current idea of the Messiah on which his self-consciousness developed itself. In that case, this consciousness could only have shaped itself in accordance with the form which that idea had assumed among his contemporaries, such as we find it to have been among his disciples during his lifetime : he must have looked upon himself as a person destined, indeed, to elevate the people of Israel morally and religiously, but exclusively and principally, with the miraculous assistance of Jehovah, to redeem them from the oppression of the Gentiles, nay, to make them an imperial nation. Had

* Life of Jesus, § 41.

he applied this idea to himself before he had acquired a religious consciousness of his own to oppose to it, it would have obtained such influence over him that he would with difficulty have got rid of it; if, on the contrary, we find it suppressed in his life and conduct, it is probable that he did not inwardly entertain it until he could combat it by means of the strengthening within him of a peculiar religious consciousness.

Now if we would learn what, independent of the national idea of the Messiah, the peculiar religious consciousness of Jesus was, we are referred, not only by the traditional view of the Church, but also by the theological tendency now prevailing, principally to the Gospel of John, in which the disciple who lay on the bosom of Jesus described the inmost secrets, as it were, of this bosom, the most profound revelations of Jesus about his own nature and his relation to God. On this point the old theology went fairly and freely to work, taking the bull by the horns, and explaining all that Jesus in the fourth Gospel says of himself, as the only begotten Son of God, as the light of the world, as him who is in the Father, and in whom mankind sees the Father, who came down from heaven and returns to heaven, simply from what is plainly stated in the same Gospel, partly as the doctrine of the Evangelist, partly also as the testimony of Jesus about himself, namely, that he, as the personal, divine creative Word, had been from eternity with God; had then for a time, for the purposes of the redemption of mankind, become man, in order, when he had fulfilled this object, again to return to God in heaven (i. 1 ff., xiv. 3, xiii. 16, vi. 62, viii. 58, xvii. 5). According to this, then, the self-consciousness of Jesus would have been that of a divine Being, who adopted, only transiently, a human body, perhaps also a human soul, and in doing so preserved a distinct recollection of his earlier condition, the full consciousness of his divinity. Even the dependence on the Father, in which this Johannine Jesus felt himself to be, was not that of a human

being on the Divine, but that of the creative subordinate God on God in the highest sense.

With a Jesus of this character, who for the theology of the ancient faith was precisely the one it required, that of the modern faith will have nothing more to do, and inasmuch as it is in its favourite Gospel that this Jesus is found in the most unmistakeable manner, it is in a difficulty. "The moment," says Schleiermacher in his *Lectures upon the Life of Jesus*, "that we allow the consciousness of a pre-existence in Jesus to be considered an actual recollection, the really human consciousness in him ceases." Consequently what Jesus in the Johannine Gospel says in this sense, must not be taken literally; there is implied in it, not a recollection, but only the assumption, that the Divine counsels, even from the first, pointed to him as the Redeemer. But when a Gospel begins with the propositions, that in the beginning was the Word, with God, and itself God, that by this was the world created, and that it subsequently became flesh in Jesus; and then this Jesus appears assuring us that he was before Abraham, and speaks of the glory which, before the world was, he had with God—then we hear the Eternal creative Word speaking plainly in the flesh, and remembering his personal existence before the creation of man, and we shall reject every other explanation of his words as garbled and untrue, like those of which the palliative theology of the present day is continually producing instances.*

It is indeed inconceivable to us that any person in the flesh should remember an ante-natal existence, even independent of the fact that in the present case it is supposed to

* Compare also, besides Lücke's Commentary, 3rd ed., i. 368 ff., together the Excursus upon the Dogmatic Contents of the Prologue of John, and different passages of the explanation, especially Luthardt, "The Gospel of John and its Peculiarities," &c., p. 203 ff., 280 ff.; Weizsacker, On the Testimony to Himself of Christ in John, *Annual of German Theology*, ii. 1, p. 154 ff.; and on the other side, Hilgenfeld, *The Gospel of John and its Modern Explanations*, *Journal of Scientific Theology*, ii. 3, p. 281 ff.

have been a divine existence reaching back to a period before the creation of the world. It is inconceivable to us, because in accredited history no instance of it has occurred. And if any one should speak of having such a recollection, we should consider him a fool, or, if not, an impostor. Now it is as difficult to believe that Jesus was either of these, in the presence of the effects which he produced, and of the speeches and acts the accounts of which are preserved to us in more credible records, as it is easy—nay, as has been indicated to us by all that has gone before—to assume that the fourth Evangelist is here making Jesus speak on the principles of the Alexandrian system. We do not therefore grudge these words their full literal meaning, any more than we allow ourselves to suppose that they were really spoken by Jesus.

But, even independent of any reference to an alleged pre-existence, the utterances of Jesus about himself in the fourth Gospel are of a kind which makes it difficult, from them, to imagine what his personal self-consciousness can have been. Whether a God, having become man, would do as the Johannine Jesus does; whether in his speeches he would so strongly and incessantly insist upon his divinity, and be so continually challenging afresh the contradiction of men, to whom a divine first person speaking out of human lips is intolerable; whether a God, become human, would not find it wiser and more becoming to let his divinity shine forth more indirectly by the glorification of his humanity—about all this nothing definite can be said, as the assumption belongs solely to the province of the imagination. But a man, whoever he may have been, could never, if his heart and head were sound, have uttered such speeches about himself as are put into the mouth of Jesus in the fourth Gospel, even independently of those salient points which reach over into an eternity existing before time. The speeches of Jesus about himself in this Gospel are an uninterrupted Doxology, only translated out of the second person into the first, from the

form of address to another, into the utterance about a self; and the fact that they are found edifying even at the present day, can only be explained by the habit of transposing them into the second person. When an enthusiastic Christian calls his Master, supposed to have been raised to heaven, the light of the world, when he says of him that he who has seen him has seen the Father, that is God himself, we excuse the faithful worshipper such extravagances. But when he goes so far as the fourth Evangelist, and puts the utterances of his own pious enthusiasm into the mouth of Jesus in the form of his own utterances about himself, he does him a very perilous service.

Every one finds the well-known expression, *l'état c'est moi*, revolting, because it claims for one man exclusively what belongs to all. In this particular case indeed there is the additional consideration that the vain prince, resting only upon appearance and show, who uttered that expression, was in no respect justified in looking upon himself as the embodiment of the state which he governed. But let us suppose a man with more right to say this, a Frederick or a Washington, even from the mouth of either of them we should be sorry to hear such an expression, or rather we feel certain that it would never occur to a man of this description to speak in this way. The saying that the King is only the head-servant of the State, is as honourable to Frederick the Great as that proud expression is disgraceful to Louis XIV. We think that the former knew too well what the State is, and what, in relation to it, even the most highly-placed individual is, to presume himself alone to represent the State. To such a character Jesus corresponds when he modestly says, "Why callest thou me good? No one is good but God alone" (Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 19). And as we honour him for this, so the sayings put into his mouth by John, "He who sees me sees the Father" (xiv. 9), or, "I and my Father are one," are offensive to us, or at any rate incomprehensible.

We think (looking at the case exclusively in a human point of view, as we are here doing) that let a man have been ever so vividly conscious of representing in himself the utmost perfection of the idea of religion, the reconciliation of human self-consciousness with Divine self-consciousness, still he will ever remember, and the more in proportion to the fineness of his religious feeling, that there is between the two a gulf not to be passed, and he will hesitate the less to declare this, the better he understands what serves to awaken among men a genuine piety. No man of true religious feeling could ever have uttered the expression, "Who sees me, sees the Father;" but it is very possible that an enthusiastic worshipper of a later age might have represented him as saying it, when he had accustomed himself to regard him as a subordinate God who had become man.

In these speeches of the Johannine Christ about himself, there remains at last as what may be genuine and possible for a human being, only so much as is common to the fourth Gospel with the three others, and it all comes to no more than this, that Jesus looked upon his relation to God in the light of a relation between a son and a father. But in the three first Gospels this view rests upon a broad rational foundation. Men who imitate God in his moral perfections, especially his benevolence, which makes no distinction of persons, but extends to good and bad alike, are called Sons of God (Matt. v. 45; comp. 9), as God, in consideration of his provident and pardoning love to men, is called their Father, their Father in heaven (Matt, v. 45, 48, vi. 1, 4, 6, 8, 36, 32, vii. 11), and is to be thus addressed in prayer by men who have elevated themselves to this intuition into the true nature of God.

On one occasion Jesus, on his own behalf, addresses God as Father and Lord of heaven and earth, in order to thank him for having withdrawn the understanding of his doctrine from the wise and the prudent and given it to babes

(Matt. xi. 25 ff.; Luke x. 21 ff.). When he does so, he appears to place himself immediately on the common ground on which every good man is justified in addressing God as Father. But when he continues (ver. 27), "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him," we are here transferred into an entirely peculiar relation in which the speaker of these words was conscious of standing on an equality with God. The case is the same as when the Jesus of John says to the Father, "All that is mine is thine, and thine is mine" (xvii. 6, 10); and again, "The Father knows me, and I know the Father" (x. 15). In the fourth Gospel, the substratum of all utterances of this kind lies in all that is said about the higher nature of Jesus: there his creative Word is personified; he sent it into the world in human form; and he has not only put mankind under its peculiar protection, but, inasmuch as without it nothing was made that was made (i. 3), everything is common to it with God the Father. But this substratum constitutes the reason why, in the fourth Gospel, we can, in an historical point of view, have nothing to do with these speeches of Christ. A Jesus who can say such things of himself has no existence for historical consideration. In the three first Gospels this substratum is wanting to the expressions quoted; from their point of view Jesus is indeed a man begotten by the Holy Ghost, but not an incarnate creative Word; and it is not until after his resurrection that all power is given to him in heaven and in earth (Matt. xxviii. 18). Accordingly, we must examine whether that speech in Matthew and Luke may not be explained on the broad principle of men being the children of God. Now we may indeed conceive how Jesus, by means of the knowledge of God as the Father, which had sprung up within him among a people which knew God only as Lord, and of themselves only as in the relation of servants

to him, and which had sprung up within him in consequence of a state of mind in which every form of opposition between his own consciousness and the consciousness of God had been removed, might feel himself to stand in a quite peculiar relation to God; he might feel that no one but he knew God aright, namely, as the Father, and that in the case of every one else, this knowledge was one which he had been the means of imparting to them. But why, then, does he add that no one but the Father knows the Son? Was, then, the Son, *i.e.* he himself, Jesus, so mysterious a Being as only to be capable of being known by God? Not so if he was a human being, but only in case of his being somehow or other a superhuman Being; so that this speech, which stands quite isolated in the first and third Gospel, refers us to a principle resembling that of the fourth Gospel, and appears, consequently, to be an addition intended to exalt the conception of Jesus above the naturally human, a step higher than is elsewhere made in those Gospels.

34. THE RELIGIOUS CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS ACCORDING TO THE THREE FIRST GOSPELS.

If, therefore, in order to get a clear understanding of the self-consciousness of Jesus, we can get a firm footing neither in the fourth Gospel nor in that passage of the synoptic Gospels in which they come in contact with the peculiarity of the former, nothing remains but to turn entirely to the side of the Synoptics. The Sermon on the Mount has always been, and rightly so, regarded as the nucleus of the synoptic speeches of Christ.* Even in the introduction to it, the new Christian view of the world drops down like a fertilizing rain in spring. The so-called eight beatitudes (Matt. v. 3—10)

* Keim calls it "the most genuine of all that is genuine."

consist from first to last of those Christian paradoxes by which the new Christian view of things comes into contrast with the traditional one both of Jews and Gentiles. The Blessed are no longer the rich, the well-fed and the joyous, but the poor, the mourners, the hungry and thirsty; the right way to happiness and wealth is no longer declared to be violence and fighting, strict maintenance of one's own right but mercy, peaceableness and patience. Compared with the ancient world, this is a world inverted, in which we do not, as in the case of the first, start from the External, and from the assumption of its agreement with the Internal, but the Internal is considered as so exclusively the Essential, that it is in a position to outweigh an opposing External, and even prefers a close connection with it.

It is well known that between Matthew and Luke there is here this difference, that in the latter (vi. 20 ff.), "the poor" absolutely—in the former, the "poor in spirit;" in the one, those who endure (real) hunger and thirst—in the other, those who hunger and thirst "after righteousness," are spoken of. I look upon the simpler statement of Luke as the more original, the additions of Matthew as a later precaution against misunderstanding, to prevent its being supposed that Jesus had blessed men merely on account of external neediness, apart from internal work. The Beatitudes certainly, as given and understood by Luke, where to those who are externally unhappy in this present world happiness in the future is promised, and by invocations of "woe," in contrast with these, punishment in the life to come is threatened to those who are happy now, remind us strongly of the views of later Ebionitism; but they may be sufficiently explained also by the experiences which Jesus as a teacher might have had. If he had found that among the higher classes of the people the feeling of a higher want had been as commonly stifled by sensual enjoyment as it had been kept alive among the poor by personal discomfort, he might, when appearing

among the oppressed masses of Galilee, have pronounced them *blessed* for being in a condition in which he found the corresponding state of mind. In every revolution (and the rise of Christianity was one of the most violent), it is the case that it is not among the well-fed and the satisfied, but among the needy and the dissatisfied, that it first finds support. But as it is not external unhappiness in itself for which the poor, the hungry, &c., are pronounced by Jesus happy, Matthew, certainly, by his additions, did not interpret the words of Jesus incorrectly—more correctly, certainly, than the Ebionites did afterwards with their ascetic exaggeration, teaching that every earthly possession was to be considered, in and for itself, in the light of a sin.

Jesus transfers the realisation of the blessedness which he promises to the now poor and oppressed into a future world—into heaven. In doing so, he stands upon the same point of view as his age and people, and from this we need not attempt to withdraw him. The internal supersensual happiness, which consists of itself in the susceptibility of something higher, appears as a future reward; and in fact the contradiction between the Internal and the External must be reconciled, the spiritual life newly awakened in mankind must adapt itself to the outward condition of the world; but this follows naturally and gradually, though never perfectly, in this world, and it is only by a religious conception that it is expected as a miraculous adjustment in a future one.

It is, then, out of the movement from the External to the Internal, as declared in the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount, that all those expositions of the law are derived that are found in the first section of the Sermon, where, in every instance, in opposition to the Pharisaic construction, which stands upon the outward act, the spirit is insisted upon as that which alone is essential, and with murder even anger and hatred, with adultery impure desire, is represented as forbidden; with perjury, all sorts of swearing are rejected as

unsuited to simple truthfulness. Contrasting what was said to the ancients, *i.e.* to the receivers of the Mosaic law, with what he now says to his disciples, Jesus places himself as the Lawgiver of the spirit, in opposition to Moses as the Lawgiver for the mere outward acts, or rather as one superior to him, who intends to bring into spiritual perfection the law of the letter which he gave. In doing so, he opposes the maxims of patience and love of enemies to the principles, genuinely Hebrew, and indeed genuinely ancient, of strict compensation, of love for a friend, hatred for an enemy (Matt. v. 38 ff.). And then this part of the Sermon concludes at last with the saying, "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." If there is a speech in the New Testament that came from the lips of Jesus, this certainly did so, and was not put into his mouth at a later period; for the whole intervening interval up to the composition of our Gospels was far too heated, and the views of men too much contracted by quarrels and fanaticism, to justify us in attributing to it the production of a speech of such cheerful liberality. Here, therefore, we have a fundamental trace of the piety of Jesus; he felt and conceived of his heavenly Father as the personification of this indiscriminating benevolence; and it is in this his view of God that the reason lies of his loving above all to describe him as his Father in heaven.

This fundamental intuition of God could not have come to Jesus from the Old Testament. In this, Jehovah was a wrathful, jealous God, recompensing and punishing strictly, and more than strictly; and though this conception was mitigated among the later prophets, still it was never completely destroyed. Intimations like that in the appearance before Elijah, where God is not in the storm, earthquake, or fire, but in the still, small voice (1 Kings xix. 12), are quite isolated; and even in the Jewish exclusiveness which repre-

sented Jehovah at all events to the heathen only as a punishing and avenging God, there was an obstacle to any milder view of his character. Hence the people of Israel was called indeed Jehovah's Son, and even the kings of Israel, as vicegerents and under the protection of God, were so called also; but the contemplation of God in relation to men generally in the light of a Father is a conception foreign to the Old Testament. Jesus made it the fundamental view of the relation of God to man; but his doing so can only have been the suggestion of his own mind; it could only have been the consequence of this, that indiscriminate benevolence was the original principle of his own nature, and he was, in this, conscious of his own harmony with God. It was a principle flowing from the innermost principle of his own heart, to allow himself, as little as God in the character of the long-suffering Father, to be induced by the wickedness of men to abandon the state of mind which conquers the evil only by the good, the enemy only by well-doing. Jesus recommended his disciples to prove themselves by such conduct to be genuine sons of their heavenly Father; he advised them to be perfect as their Father in heaven was perfect (Matt. v. 48). To us, all this means that he conceived of God in a moral point of view as resembling his own spirit in the most exalted moments of his own religious life, and that by this ideal again he strengthened that religious life. But the most exalted religious spirit living in his consciousness was that comprehensive love which overcame the evil only by the good, and which therefore he transferred to God as the fundamental principle of his nature.

Men being in their relation to God as children, they are in their relation to one another brothers (Matt. v. 22 ff.), and hence results in that relation to one another an equality which renders it our duty not to behave differently to another than towards ourselves, not to judge him strictly and ourselves indulgently (Matt. vii. 3 ff.), and generally and at

all times only to treat him as we ourselves wish to be treated (Matt. vii. 12). Particular stress has always been laid upon this precept, and rightly so, as the peculiar moral principle of Christianity; there is involved in it the fundamental notion of humanity, the subordination of all individuals to the common idea of mankind, which lives in all men, should be by every one recognised in every one, and respected.

In so far as Jesus, by the spirit of human love and the actions that flow from it, was elevated above all the obstructions and limits of human life, and felt himself one with his heavenly Father, there hence arose for him an inward blessedness, compared with which all external joys and sorrows lost their importance. Hence that cheerful absence of care which in the presence of trouble about food and clothing refers to that God who clothes the lilies and feeds the sparrows (Matt. vi. 25); the contentment with a life of wandering which often offered not a place whereon to lay his head (Matt. viii. 20); the indifference to external honour or contempt in the consciousness of being the bearer and the messenger of the mind of God to men. Hence that love for children, who in their harmless and unpretending nature, untainted by pride and hatred, come nearest to that blessed spirit of love, and offer themselves, on the other hand, as the most obvious objects of it (Matt. xviii. 3 ff., xix. 14 ff.). Hence the readiness to offer the left cheek also to him who has struck the right; to be willing to go two miles with him who has claimed one (Matt. v. 44 ff.); and, moreover, to forgive the offending brother not merely seven times, but seventy times seven (Matt. xviii. 21 ff.).

While Jesus was forming within himself this cheerful tone of mind, identical with that of God, comprehending all men as brothers, he had realised in himself the prophetic ideal of a new covenant with the law written in the heart (Jerem. xxxi. 31 ff.); he had, to speak with the poet, "adopted the Deity into his will;" hence for him "that Deity had descended

from his throne of the universe, the gulf had been filled up, the dread phenomenon had vanished ;” in him men had passed from slavery to freedom. This cheerful, tranquil tone, this course of action proceeding from the pleasure and joyousness of a bright spirit, we might call the Hellenic element in Jesus. But this impulse of the heart, and, harmonising with it, his conception of God, was in him purely spiritual and moral. The Greek could attain to this only by means of philosophy, but in him it was an incidental gift with which his education according to the Mosaic law, the formation of his mind by the writings of the prophets, had endowed him.

If we ask how this harmonious mental constitution had come to exist in Jesus, there is nowhere in the accounts of his life that lie before us any intimation of severe mental struggles from which it proceeded. It is indeed well known that, with the exception of the legends of his infancy, those accounts embrace only the short period of his public ministry, and represent him, moreover, from a point of view excluding all human peccability ; hence one might suppose that that period of cheerful unity with himself might have been preceded by another of gloomy struggle and also of numerous deviations from the right way. But, unless all analogies deceive us, traces of this must have been discoverable in his later life, regarding which we are not without information. In all those natures which were not purified until they had gone through struggles and violent disruption (think only of a Paul, an Augustin, and a Luther), the shadowy colours of this exist for ever, and something harsh, severe, and gloomy, clings to them all their lives ; but of this in Jesus no trace is found.* Jesus appears as a beautiful nature from the first,

* Hints of such a struggle are supposed to be found in the history of the Temptation. But this notion rests solely upon a modern perversion of this narrative, the true meaning of which, as we shall see in the proper place, can scarcely be misunderstood. The Agony at Gethsemane, too, even historically understood, is only a struggle to preserve a state of mind long habitual, not an endeavour to arrive at it for the first time.

which had only to develop itself out of itself, to become more clearly conscious of itself, ever firmer in itself, but not to change and begin a new life: a condition which naturally does not exclude individual uncertainties and errors, the necessity of a constant serious effort to overcome self and deny self, as Jesus acknowledged by disclaiming, as has been stated above, the predicate of "good" attributed to him. For the different, or rather the evasive, form in which this speech is represented in Matthew, xix. 17, is as certainly a later alteration, as the challenge in John, "Which of you can convince me of sin?" is nothing but an expression of the Johannine Logoschristus. The inward development of Jesus proceeded, if not without strong effort, still without any violent crisis. And this is also the only real sense of the dogma of sinlessness of Jesus, with which in its strict ecclesiastical meaning, as a purely negative idea, there is absolutely nothing to be done. As has already been intimated, the highly gifted Apostle of the Gentiles did not in this respect resemble his Master, and even the two great reformers of Christianity in later times, Augustin and Luther, were in this point more Pauline than Christian. But if one were ever to arise in whom the religious Genius of modern times were from the first to become flesh, in the way in which the Genius of *his* time became so in him, such a person would scarcely, like those broken natures, support himself on his predecessor, but would carry on his work in an independent spirit.

35. RELATION OF JESUS TO THE MOSAIC LAW.

As Jesus had brought to perfection the harmony of his religious life, his peace and union with God, by purely spiritual means, through developing the impulse of love which lived in him, so he had also come into a peculiar relation to

all the outward instrumentalities through which his countrymen sought to reach this point. Those instrumentalities must have appeared to him in the light of a circuitous route which he, at least, no longer considered as necessary for himself; others, who could not follow him on the shortest road, might think that they required the other, and perhaps really did require it, though there was danger that many might continue on the longer road before, or without ever, reaching their object.

To the question of the scribe as to the chief commandments of the law, Jesus explained that the maxims of loving God with the whole heart, and one's neighbour as oneself, contained the nucleus and essence of the law and the prophets (Matt. xxii. 35 ff.; Mark xii. 28). But the addition which Mark puts into the mouth of the scribe, that the observance of that commandment is more than burnt-offerings or any other offerings, is undoubtedly only the Evangelist's own addition, though containing certainly a perfectly correct explanation of the meaning of Jesus. One main part of the Jewish sacrifices consisted of sin-offerings for errors and sins committed; the supposition, therefore, was, that these would not be forgiven by God without these sacrifices. On the other hand, we see Jesus, where he observed upright repentance, faith, and love, at once granting forgiveness of sins out of the fulness of his own religious consciousness (Matt. ix. 2 ff.; Luke vii. 47 ff.). He assumes the same position towards the festival of the Sabbath which was so important to the Jews and even to the prophets. He did indeed, on this day, abstain from ordinary work himself; but when either a real necessity or a higher duty required an outward effort, he did not hesitate a moment either to make that effort himself or to allow it to his followers. In the well-known narrative of the plucking of the ears of corn, it is indeed only Mark who puts into his mouth the expression, "Man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man" (ii. 27); but Matthew

also makes him say, "If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless" (xii. 7). This is only the same view as we noticed above in the case of several of the Hebrew prophets; but it is enunciated by Jesus so pointedly, and offence at his working on the Sabbath is so evidently rather sought than avoided by him, that it can scarcely be doubted that the worthlessness of all this outward service contrasted with the inner had not only become in itself obvious to him, but that he looked for ways and means of gradually opening the eyes of his countrymen to it.

It is not indeed quite clear how far the views and opinions of Jesus went in this direction. A great portion of his polemics are undoubtedly directed against the additions which later teachers had made to the Mosaic law, and upon the observance of which the Pharisaic party insisted quite as strongly as upon those of the precepts of the law. Thus, in the law, ablutions were prescribed for all sorts of real or supposed pollutions, as, for instance, touching a dead body, a woman in child-bed, and the like; but the direction to wash the hands before a meal was a Rabbinical addition, to which Jesus and his followers did not bind themselves (Matt. xv. 1 ff.). What made him particularly disinclined to the Pharisaic keeping of such precepts was, as has been intimated above, the danger of men's continuing to adhere to this circuitous route to God, neglecting for such ceremonies the inward essence of piety, nay, even moral duties. It appeared that one person, in order to reserve means for providing a sacrifice which he had vowed, deprived his parents of their needful support (Matt. xv. 5); that another obeyed the rule of giving to the Levites the tithe of the fruits of the earth, even to anise and cummin seed, of which there was no mention in the law, but made light of the moral commands given in it (Matt. xxiii. 23). It is true that Jesus only meets these cases with the saying, that this should be done and the latter

not left undone, *i.e.* that when a serious effort has been made to fulfil the moral precepts of the law, it is perfectly praiseworthy to try also to obey the ceremonial, but that in no case should the first be neglected for the sake of the second. In the introduction also to the same anti-pharisaic speech in which this saying occurs, he exhorts the people to live according to all the precepts of Scribes and Pharisees, but not after their example, as they do not themselves practise what they preach (Matt. xxiii. 3). But in that very place he designates the burdens which these men lay upon the people as too heavy to be borne; and when on another occasion, as if in opposition to them, he calls his burden light and his yoke easy (Matt. xi. 30), and on occasion of the neglect by his followers to wash their hands, says that every tree which his heavenly Father did not plant shall be rooted out (Matt. xv. 13), it is plain enough that he looked upon this Rabbinical system of rules as burdensome and objectionable, and resting moreover on no higher authority, as that which men might put up with for a time, but whose days were numbered.

But whether Jesus went beyond these Rabbinical additions, and with them wished to attack the Mosaic law itself on its ritual side, is, looking to the character of our sources of information, a question difficult to answer. When, on occasion of the reproaches uttered against him on account of his disciples eating with unwashed hands, he calls upon the people to understand him, and says, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man" (Matt. xv. 11), he was either not aware of the drift of his own words, or he had said that which deprived the Mosaic prohibitions, so much insisted on, regarding different kinds of food, of their importance; nay, when in opposition to the rule (5 Mos. xxiv. 1) which allowed of divorce under the condition of a writing of divorce being exhibited by the husband to the wife, he declared every divorce, except on the ground of adultery, to be itself adultery, and

attributed that rule to a transient regard for the hard-heartedness of the Jewish people (Matt. v. 3 ff., xix. 3 ff.), he declared the Mosaic law, looking even beyond its ritual limits, to be admitting of improvement, consequently imperfect, in the rules contained in it that concerned the moral and social relations of men.

Still, all further conjecture on this head appears to be stopped by the declaration of Jesus himself in the Sermon on the Mount: that it was not to be supposed that he had come to destroy the law or the prophets; he had not come to destroy, but to fulfil: for that sooner shall heaven and earth pass away than the smallest letter of the law shall pass away: whoever, therefore, shall break the smallest of the precepts of it and teach men so, he shall be the least; but whoever keeps them and teaches men to keep them, he shall be great in the kingdom of heaven (Mark v. 17—19). If in this passage, by the smallest commands and the least letter of the law only ceremonial rules may be understood, then Jesus, in this department also of the Mosaic law, had recognised not merely tolerance towards it, but the inviolable validity of it for all times.

But on this supposition the plan and entire position of Jesus become absolutely unintelligible. Different commentators, therefore, have discovered in the passing away of heaven and earth, a real limit, and indeed, according to the conception of those times, a not very distant one, namely, the destruction of the world expected after the return of the Messiah and the judgment to be held by him, in the sense that so long, indeed, as this old world stands, the law is to remain valid even to its smallest particular, but to have no further validity for the new world then to be expected. But every unprejudiced reader will, on the contrary, understand the words of Jesus as Luke understood them when he gave the words in this form (xvi. 17): that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail, *i.e.* one

is of as infinite duration as the other ; with which, as regards the usage of language, passages like Job xiv. 12 ; Ps. lxxii. 7 ; Bar. i. 11, may be compared. Others, therefore, have probably been more correct in conjecturing that we have here a subsequent attempt to give the words of Jesus greater point, in the interest of the Judaising Christianity of a later period ; and in him who breaks these minor rules and teaches men so, and shall therefore be called least in the kingdom of heaven, have found an allusion to the Apostle Paul, who calls himself, also, the least of the Apostles (1 Cor. xv. 9).

The latter of these suppositions I am not quite prepared to defend. But the former may, I think, be corroborated by pointing out that the difficult verses, 18, 19, betray themselves at once to be an interpolation, not indeed into the text of our present Gospel of Matthew, but into the speech of Jesus, and, perhaps, an earlier report of it. In verse 19, he who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, is threatened with the lowest place in the kingdom of heaven : he, on the other hand, who keeps them and teaches men to keep them, is promised a high one. And then in verse 20, it goes on : "For I say to you, that except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." Now these two assertions are inconsistent with each other. For by this surpassing of the righteousness of the Pharisees is understood, as is shewn by the explanations, beginning with ver. 21, about the Mosaic prohibitions against murder, adultery, and perjury, the fulfilment of the law not merely in the letter but the spirit, the avoidance not merely of the wicked act but also of the corresponding disposition ; along with murder that of hatred and revenge, with adultery the first movement of licentious passion. And there is no reason whatever given for exceeding the righteousness of the Pharisees in this sense, when, as must be the case

according to the present sequence of the propositions, it is said that therefore the smallest ceremonial rules must be kept inviolate, for in doing so, at all events, the Pharisees could not be surpassed. If we look more closely, the connecting formula, "For I say unto you," occurs twice: once (strengthened by "verily") at the beginning of verse 18, then again at the beginning of verse 20; and if we place the twentieth verse where the formula occurs for the first time, unsuited as it is to that verse in its present position, we get the best possible connection. For then Jesus will explain the meaning of the fulfilment or perfect accomplishment of the law, which is the object of his mission, not in the mode in which he is now made to do in Matthew by the unexpected turn to the letter, of which not even the least is to be given up; but when he says, I am not come to destroy but to fulfil, for no good has come yet of the fulfilment of the law by the Pharisees, with mere formality without morality, which avoids indeed the outward act, but clings to the evil disposition in the mind—if we conceive of this as having been the course of Jesus' thoughts, the logical connection of the words is complete, and they are also perfectly consistent with the spirit of Jesus' whole career. The words of Jesus may originally have been delivered in this form, whether orally or even in writing, and no offence was taken at them so long as the observance of the ceremonial law of Moses continued unshaken among the Christians who had been Jews. But when the Apostle Paul, in connection with his application to the heathen, had released the Christians from the observance of the law, and caused thereby in Jewish-Christian circles that commotion which we know was caused, both from his own letters and in part also from the Acts of the Apostles, then that saying of Jesus which admitted so easily of being explained in a Pauline sense was objected to, or rather it was supposed that it must originally have been in its full extent in a form more decidedly favourable to the upholding of the law of Moses,

and therefore the propositions in vers. 18 and 19 were interpolated, after which ver. 20, which properly belongs to ver. 17, was made to follow.

How clearly Jesus was himself conscious of the novelty of his principle, and of its incompatibility with the old Jewish system, is evident also from the way in which he expressed himself on occasion of the fasting (Matt. ix. 14—17). Surprise was expressed at his not compelling his disciples to frequent fasting, as the Baptist had done; for among the Jews, who ever strove to attain to especial sanctity, like the Pharisees, and the Essenes too, endeavoured to prove that he was doing so by going beyond the annual fasts prescribed by the law (3 Mos. xvi. 29) on the day of expiation, and imposing upon himself all kinds of voluntary fasts. It is thus that the self-complacent Pharisee in the parable (Luke xviii. 12) boasts of performing those pious exercises even twice in the week. Now here Jesus speaks not merely as before (Matt. vi. 16 ff.) against the hypocrisy that generally accompanied the Pharisaic fastings, and does not even satisfy himself with the declaration that for his disciples, so long, at least, as he is among them, asceticism so gloomy is unsuitable, but he annexes the saying about the old garment upon which a new piece of cloth is sewn, the old bottle into which men do not put new wine, if the garment is not to be rent, and the wine to be spilt upon the ground (v. 16 ff.). And in this he appears to declare his conviction that generally between the principle established by him respecting the inward disposition and the old ceremonial system, no reconciliation is possible, or that in case the attempt to combine the one with the other is ever made, the impossibility of uniting the two will very soon betray itself.

As regards the sacrificial system, Jesus assumes it to be continuing not merely *en passant* (Matt. v. 23), but according to the evangelical narrative expressly directs the leper whom he had cleansed, to offer for his purification (Matt. viii. 4;

Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14) the sacrifices prescribed by Moses (3 Mos. xiv. 10 ff.). On the other hand, it has been far too little observed that in our evangelical narratives Jesus himself never takes part in the Jewish sacrifices, with the exception of that of the Paschal Lamb. Besides sacrifices for purification and sin, there were also burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and thank-offerings, which a pious Israelite might have occasion to make. And there were also on all occasions less expensive gifts provided for poorer persons, but we nowhere find a trace of such an offering having been made by Jesus or his disciples. It is true that on this point the silence of our records is not a complete proof, though we may remember the shortness of the sojourn at Jerusalem, which, according to the Synoptics, was the only one he ever made; but an act of Jesus is recounted in the Gospels which points positively to a tone of mind but little favourable to the sacrificial system. We mean the so-called purification of the Temple, which is told by all four Evangelists (Matt. xxi. 12 ff.; Mark xi. 15 ff.; Luke xix. 45 ff.; John ii. 14 ff.), where Jesus, in the Temple at Jerusalem (*i.e.* as must be supposed, in one of its entrance courts), meeting with buyers and sellers, especially dealers in doves, according to John, also with dealers in oxen and sheep with their animals, and money-changers besides, is much displeased at such desecration of the sanctuary, overthrows the tables, and drives them out. Reimar* pointed out, by way of illustration, that so long as the law of Moses remained in force, it was necessary, especially at the time of the Passover, that animals of all kinds for sacrifice should be brought to the Temple for the use of foreigners visiting the festival, that for this purpose a space in the most outward precincts of the Temple, the so-called court of the Gentiles, was legally cleared, and that it was regarded as an indication of pious zeal when a considerable number of cattle were brought there for sale. Quite

* Comp. Reimar, ed. Strauss, 195 ff.

as indispensable in the same place were the money-changers, who enabled the visitors to the festival to exchange their ordinary money for the coins current in the Temple. Now it would appear, indeed, that Jesus, when he says the house of prayer ought not to be made a den of thieves, took particular offence at the cheating which went on with the business of trading and exchanging. But he also quotes the saying of Jeremiah (vii. 11), who will not hear of Jehovah's Temple being made a den of murderers, and he introduces also the other quotation from Isaiah (lvi. 7), where the Temple is called a house of prayer. And this leads to the supposition that all this material sacrificial system was offensive to him as compared with such spiritual sacrifice. Epiphanius says of the Ebionites,* that in their pretended Gospel of Matthew there occurs this expression of Christ: "I am come to do away with sacrifices, and if you do not cease to sacrifice, the anger (of God) will not cease from you." This is that horror of bloody sacrifices which the Ebionites had in common with the Essenes, and which, together with the Essenic abstinence from meat, is founded on the ascetic and dualistic view of the world and life peculiar to this order. From this view Jesus was far removed; but he had a conviction that reconciliation with God was only attainable by purely inward means. And hence his displeasure at the gross materialism of the sacrificial service was all the more natural, and might easily betray him into that act of prophetic zeal, especially if he saw for the first time on this occasion this beast-market being held in the Temple.

Jesus, however, seems to have taken up a position to the whole of the Jewish Temple service not quite so harmless as appears in our Gospels. It is well known that among the proofs of the truth of the Johannine representation of the history of Jesus as compared with that in the Synoptics, is alleged the improbability of a pious Israelite having allowed

* Hæres. xxx. 16.

several years to pass away, as, according to the three first Gospels, we must believe Jesus did, without travelling to one of the high festivals at Jerusalem, according to the precept of the law. On the other hand, several reasons have been brought forward to explain such an omission. It would be the most satisfactory explanation if it were shewn that Jesus was not, in point of fact, that pious Israelite. In the accounts of the Evangelists that the High Council set up false witnesses against Jesus, Reimar discovered a misrepresentation of the real facts, as there were sufficient grounds for a true indictment, and even the expulsion of the buyers and sellers out of the Temple alone was sufficient to constitute an accusation against him.* But what if, in the expression attributed to Jesus by the false witnesses, that he was able to destroy the Temple of God, and within three days to build it up again (Matt. xxvi. 61), there was only embodied in a few bold words the same spirit which appears in that expulsion as a daring act? It is well known that John introduces this saying as having been uttered on the occasion of the purifying of the Temple, which is by him transposed to the beginning of the public ministry of Jesus. And he mentions it as a real speech of Jesus, not as false evidence against him. In him the only falsehood is in the misunderstanding of the speech, which, as he recounts it, must certainly have referred to the death and the resurrection of Jesus, but is referred by the Jews to the edifice of their Temple (ii. 19 ff.). Mark (xiv. 58) attributes to the declaration of the false witnesses the sense that Jesus announced his purpose of destroying the Temple "made with hands," and building one instead "not made with hands." But this is only his own explanation, put by him into the mouth of Jesus. It is, however, probable, from comparison with the Acts of the Apostles, that it is more consonant with the mind of Jesus than the far-fetched

* P. 208, as quoted above.

allusion in John to the resurrection. There (while in the Gospel Luke passes over this false evidence, as if he had wished to leave it for the second division of his work) it is likewise stated by false witnesses against Stephen, that he had declared that Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place (the Temple) and change the usages handed down by Moses (Acts vi. 14). In this passage only the destruction of the Temple is spoken of, without the rebuilding; but the changing of the Mosaic worship being added to the first, it is clear that the introduction of a spiritual worship of God must be looked upon as a rebuilding, and to this without doubt Mark too intended to allude, though by the Temple not made with hands he may perhaps have understood literally a miraculous edifice actually descending from heaven. In the account also of Stephen, the witnesses are characterised as false, and yet he also in his speech disallows to the Temple made with hands the dignity of a true dwelling of God (vii. 48). This is certainly an ancient view, already in the Old Testament put into the mouth of Solomon (1 Kings viii. 27), and naturally resulting from the Hebrew idea of God; but the rage of the Jews, breaking out in the manner it did against Stephen and the whole of the young Christian Church, shews that Stephen had expressed that view not in so harmless a form as many prophets had done long before, to the greater honour of God, but with a practical tendency that was objectionable to them. Hence results the supposition that he had really said something of the kind which the witnesses said he had, and they, consequently, were not false witnesses. The meaning of his declaration might have been that Jesus will, when he comes again from heaven, destroy the Temple and do away with the Mosaic worship connected with it; and if we find testimony against Jesus himself to exactly the same effect, there is every probability that this was only false in so far as it was brought forward in the sense of a real and material destruction and rebuilding of the

Temple. But it might very easily be the case that even this pretended misunderstanding was fictitious, that the Jews understood only too well the expression of Jesus about his reforming purpose, and that in this lay the ground of the accusation against him and of the condemnation of him.

Terror at these results then produces the effect of his followers abandoning the dangerous position which their Master had occupied, and retreating several steps; a process all the easier as none of the Apostles even, according to our present accounts, had attained to the full understanding of the mind of Jesus. Stephen, who was undoubtedly from his name a Jew born in some part of Greece, appears to have understood the true meaning of Jesus better than the Apostles of Palestine, and to have had a foreboding in his mind of the coming dislodgment of the ceremonial service in the Temple; the consequence of which was that the same fate befel him as befel his Master. Hence the Jewish Apostles and Jewish Christians in Jerusalem continued all the more to adhere to the course of conduct which was not only safer but also more adapted to their understandings; and it was in this spirit that now the history of Jesus was remodelled, and thus everything disappeared out of it that had any allusion to his earlier position, with the exception of traces, scarcely intelligible, like the history of the false witnesses. To this extent it may be admitted, as was pointed out above, that the expression of the Johannine Christ about the spiritual worship of God, confined no longer to any particular locality (iv. 21, 23 ff.), approaches nearer to the real mind and standpoint of Jesus than that of Matthew about the indestructibility of the letter of the law; not that we have here any superior historical information, except in so far as the author of the fourth Gospel subsequently attained by means of his Alexandrian education to that insight which Jesus gained in the midst of Palestine by a free spirit of religious thought.

36. POSITION OF JESUS TOWARDS THE NON-ISRAELITES.

If Jesus saw that the Mosaic worship of God did not correspond to the true essence of religion, and proposed by a careful dissemination of this view to bring about a reform of the Jewish system of religion, the question as to his position towards the non-Israelites appears already answered. For with the Mosaic ceremonial worship, which was arranged principally for the express purpose of separating the people of Israel from the other nations, the partition-wall between Jews and Gentiles was also destroyed. Still this point requires a special investigation. For in history it is never a matter of course that an individual actor has ever himself revolved the full consequences of his principles, and Jesus, even if he did this, may still from prudential motives have acted with reserve toward those who were not Israelites.

It has already been transiently mentioned in the Introduction, that as regards this subject we have in the Gospels a regular gradation of different points of view both in the expressions and the acts of Jesus. In one place we have the command given to the disciples not to turn to the heathen or Samaritans, for we must take in these mixed people who were on the same footing as the heathen. In another, we find many expressions favourable to the Samaritans, most joyful emotion on the approach of the heathen, and, finally, the direction given to the disciples to proclaim the gospel to both. In one place we find the soil of Samaria carefully avoided by Jesus; in another, the district entered without hesitation—nay, on this very soil a particularly pleasing act performed by him. In one place, a refusal at first to assist a heathen woman; in another, the most ready willingness to confer a benefit on a heathen man who is immediately exalted above the Jews on account of his faith, with the addition of a threat that some time or other the heathen shall be

called into the kingdom of heaven in the place of the stiff-necked Jewish nation. Looking more accurately at the different passages, we find the avoidance of the Samaritan soil in Matthew (xix. 1) and Mark (xvi. 1), the fearless entrance upon it and the favourable expressions about the Samaritans in Luke (ix. 52, x. 33 ff., xvii. 11 ff.), the successful ministration of Jesus in Samaria in John (iv. 5 ff.); with regard to the heathen, the foreboding emotion in his mind on their approach in the Gospel of John (xii. 20 ff.), the command not to turn to them in the Gospel of Matthew (x. 5); then in the same Gospel (xxviii. 19), as in Mark (xvi. 15) and Luke (xxiv. 47), the order to preach the gospel to them; and again, in the same Gospel, both the story of the captain of Capernaum shewing a friendly spirit towards the heathen (viii. 5 ff.), and that about the Canaanitish woman, in which the heathen are compared with dogs (xv. 21 ff.). In this scale we shall be inclined, everything considered, to place Jesus and his own peculiar mode of acting quite as little on the highest as on the lowest step. As regards the Samaritans, the account which the fourth Evangelist gives us of the meeting of Jesus and the Samaritan woman at Jacob's Well is partly so evidently poetical in itself, and partly so copied from the scene at the Well between Jacob and Rachel, Eliezer and Rebecca (1 Mos. xxiv. 29), partly so unmistakeably composed as an example for the subsequent ministry of the Apostles in Samaria (Acts viii. 4 ff.), and later still for the conversion of the heathen, in part it is so closely connected with the peculiar and exclusive mode in which this Gospel deals with the several journeys of Jesus to attend the festivals, that it offers no safe historical support. Then we have the scene with the heathen, the announcement of whose coming awakens profound mental emotion in Jesus, and is the occasion of the speeches about his own glorification and the grain of corn which must die before it can produce fruit. But the scene is compiled in such a manner, in the

most characteristic spirit of the Johannine Gospel from the two synoptic accounts of the Transfiguration and the Agony in the Garden, that historically it is entitled to no consideration. The concluding direction to teach and baptize all nations without distinction, is put into the mouth of Jesus when risen from the dead, and therefore stands or falls with the Resurrection. But even independent of this, it is inconceivable that the question whether the gospel was to be preached to the heathen or not, should afterwards have excited disputes so violent, and that the older Apostles, the constant attendants upon Jesus, should, from the very first, have placed themselves on the negative side of the question if Jesus had spoken so decisively and solemnly in the affirmative.

On the other side, we have the express command given to the missionary disciples not to go into the way of the heathen or to any Samaritan city. They are to confine themselves to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. These directions, especially if the passage about the dogs to which what is holy is not to be given, and the swine, before which pearls are not to be thrown (Matt. vii. 6), refers to preaching to the heathen, are so grossly Jewish, that in the mouth of Jesus, like the promise of everlasting duration for the letter of the law, they make his meaning and purpose unintelligible. They are understood, indeed, as the result of a temporary rule of prudence. It is said that in order to gain a firm footing for the preaching of the gospel first among the Jews, he was obliged to spare at the outset their prejudices towards the heathen, and to impress the necessity of this upon his disciples. But where was the necessity of impressing this upon the disciples when they were already full of Jewish prejudices, and especially of dislike to heathens and Samaritans? For them such a prohibition was superfluous. If Jesus gave it, he must have given it in good earnest and *bonâ fide*, and in this way it cannot have come from him, if his whole intention and ministry is not to be an enigma to us.

On the other hand, these expressions and acts of the Jesus of the Evangelists relating to the non-Israelites, the sense of which lies between these two extreme points, are historically conceivable. The population of the border-land of Galilee was very much intermixed, and in it he must frequently have come into contact with the heathen. And here Jesus might undoubtedly notice more than once that individual heathens shewed more susceptibility as hearers of his preaching, met him with more open confidence, were more readily persuaded of the necessity of beginning a new life, than the prejudiced and pretentious sons of Abraham. It would be then perfectly characteristic of him to open himself freely to such impressions and experiences, to apply them on the one hand to excite feelings of shame or earnestness in his fellow-countrymen, and on the other, the more, on the side of the latter, proofs were accumulated of their unsusceptibility and ill-will, he may gradually have formed the idea in his mind that the result might come to this, that instead of the descendants of Abraham, heathen believers would form the majority in the Church to be founded by him. An expression of Jesus pointing in that direction is recorded at the conclusion of the account of the captain of Capernaum. That account is indeed a miraculous one; but it is of course evident that proofs of a more liberal, more believing spirit among the heathen might be connected with other quite natural occasions. The narrative of the Canaanitish woman, likewise miraculous, results also in Jesus expressing his surprise at the strength of faith found in a heathen woman. In the introduction to it, however, it forms a contrast to the other in so far as this, that in the case of the Roman officer Jesus is ready from the first to grant his prayer, while the Canaanitish woman is met by two refusals from the Jewish point of view, which are only overcome by her persevering and trustful supplication. The harshness, which was not to be expected after the previous case of the captain, is explained

by Mark (vii. 24) on the ground of a wish on the part of Jesus to maintain his incognito in that Phœnician border-country. But this is evidently only an attempt on his own responsibility to mitigate the repulsiveness of the narrative. If Jesus is supposed to have really acted thus, we may adopt one of two explanations. Either that the event took place earlier, at the beginning of his ministry, and consequently the history must have been placed by the Evangelists too late, or that Jesus, when in the Jewish spirit he demurred to granting the woman's prayer, was not in earnest, but only intended to test her faith, and thereby to make her conduct more of an example to his Jewish followers. It is, however, much more obvious to look upon the narrative, which in its present miraculous form cannot be purely historical, as a mythical symbol of the course which the preaching of the gospel subsequently took. The stiff-necked Jewish prejudice against the admission of the heathen world to Christianity had been overcome by their faithful perseverance in the effort to obtain it. Thus Jesus himself, after repeated refusal at first, must have been persuaded by the persevering and humble faith of a heathen woman to pour out his blessing upon her.

The slight connection which Jesus had with the Temple at Jerusalem and its services facilitated his victory over the Jewish prejudices against the Samaritans. For the existence of the opposition Temple on Gerizim was a principal cause of the acrimonious feeling of the Jews against the Samaritans. It has been, indeed, already remarked of the expression of Jesus in the fourth Gospel (iv. 21, 23), that the time would come, and was already, when men should worship God neither in the one nor the other of these Temples, but in spirit and in truth, that in this form it is certainly not historical, but due entirely and solely to the historical and religious philosophical point of view of the later writer. Still it probably expresses a sentiment not very remote from the direction in

which Jesus' own views tended. It may very well be supposed, notwithstanding, that Jesus on the occasion of his journey to the festival at Jerusalem spared the national prejudice, and in the train, perhaps, of other Galileans, instead of going by the nearer way through Samaria, took the circuitous route by the east of the Jordan, as Matthew and Mark say, and in any case the account of Luke (xvii. 11), who makes him pass through Samaria, is so confused, and in some passages so anachronous, that it affords scarcely any historical support; for the communications with the Samaritans which he speaks of, with the exception of the engagement of the lodgings (ix. 52 ff.), might all have taken place before the journey to the feast, on the occasion of an earlier approach to the Samaritan frontiers. It is however quite as possible that the representation given in Matthew may have been derived from the Judaising prejudices of the circle out of which the Gospel originally came, and for which it was intended, and that in Luke, notwithstanding his confusion in details, an account on the whole correct may have been preserved. At all events, the narratives of the charitable and the grateful Samaritans (Luke x. 30 ff., xvii. 12 ff.) teach us the same thing with regard to the Samaritans, as the histories of the officer and the Canaanitish woman with regard to the heathen, namely, that, in the one case as well as in the other, Jesus had had experiences that made him contrast these people with his Jewish countrymen as examples calculated to put them to shame. It cannot, indeed, be denied that narratives of this kind, favourable to the Samaritans, might have been subsequently invented in the interest of a spirit favourable to the heathen in general, attributed to Jesus, and adopted into the Paulinising Gospel of Luke. Moreover, it is clear from its character as a miraculous history that the hand of an inventor has been at work in that of the grateful Samaritan. But, on the other hand, a feeling in Jesus towards the Samaritans, such as appears in the narratives in question, has nothing in

it historically improbable, and the fact of their being found merely in the third Gospel does not of itself justify us in rejecting them, so far as their fundamental principle is concerned.

In all this we may assume to a certain extent an enlargement of the views of Jesus.* We may suppose him at first to have limited his call to his own people among whom he had grown up, and with whom he stood on the same footing, not only of monotheism generally, but also of Old Testament revelation. As time, however, went on, and his communications with heathen settlers and neighbours and the Samaritan borderers on Galilee multiplied his experiences of astonishing susceptibility on their part, and of afflicting obstinacy on the part of the Jews, he may continually have gone on including the former more and more in his scheme, and have elevated himself at last to the prospect of a collective admission of them into the society founded by him. For this, however, he made no immediate arrangements, but left everything beyond to time and the natural development of things.

37. RELATION OF JESUS TO THE IDEA OF THE MESSIAH.

We have so far endeavoured to exhibit the peculiar religious consciousness of Jesus in the position he occupied towards the law of Moses on the one side, and towards the heathens and Samaritans on the other, without taking notice of the relation which he assumed towards the Messianic idea of his people. But we must not be understood as intending to imply that all the thoughts and views hitherto explained had been fully developed in him before coming to the conviction that he was the Messiah promised to his nation. There must have

* So far as this I agree with Keim, p. 40, as quoted above.

been the fundamental principle of his peculiar religious character, there must have been the idealism, the tendency towards self-contemplation, towards the separation of religion from politics on the one hand, from ceremonies on the other, the cheerful certainty of being able to attain to peace with God and himself in a purely spiritual way. But this is all that we suppose to have existed and to have grown up in Jesus to a certain maturity and consistency before he identified himself with the Messiah-Idea, and in these qualities alone do we find the explanation of his having adopted it in a manner so independent and so peculiarly his own.

That the relation which Jesus assumed towards the Jewish idea of the Messiah was assumed under peculiar conditions, may be gathered from the mode in which he described himself in his particular calling. Beside the term Christ, *i.e.* Messiah, there were, according to our Gospels, two appellations current in the country: the same personage was sometimes called Son of David, after the king whose descendant and greater successor he was supposed to be; sometimes, like the people of Israel itself and the best of their kings, only in the highest sense, the Son of God. Jesus is addressed as Son of David by persons desirous of his help, the blind men at Jericho and the Canaanitish woman (Matt. ix. 27, xv. 22, xx. 31); after he had healed the blind and dumb demoniac, the people ask, "Is not this the Son of David?" (Matt. xii. 23), and as such they salute him on his entrance into Jerusalem (Matt. xxi. 9). How much, on these alleged occasions of calling him so, was historical, is here left undecided; but this much in any case is clear, that the expression, Son of David, was at that time an appellation of the Messiah commonly current among the Jewish people. But Jesus never calls himself so. On one occasion, indeed, he expresses himself with regard to this term in a way which is almost like a disavowal of it. He asks the Pharisees whose Son they consider the Messiah to be? (Matt. xxii. 41 ff.), without

express reference to his own person. They answer in terms corresponding to the prevailing opinion of the people, "David's Son." He then puts the further question: "How then could David, in the 110th Psalm, call him, who was according to their belief his Son, his Lord?" And to this they can make no reply. Now in this case only one of two things is conceivable. Either Jesus had a solution in reserve which reconciled the relation of subordination involved in the appellation of the Messiah as David's Son with the relation of superiority involved in the description of him as David's Lord; but this could only have been the supposition of a higher nature in the Messiah, by means of which he was, according to the flesh or according to the law, a descendant of David, but according to the spirit a higher being proceeding immediately from God. But the three first Evangelists have nowhere else put this view in the mouth of Jesus, and we are not therefore justified in looking for it in the narrative before us. The only remaining supposition therefore is, that Jesus considered the contradiction as really insoluble, and therefore, as he evidently sided with the Psalm, in which according to the customary interpretation David (not that the Psalm is his) calls the Messiah (who is quite as little addressed in the Psalm) his Lord, intended to declare the theory of his being the Son of David as inadmissible. In his view, therefore, the Messiah was a higher than David, as on another occasion he described himself as greater than Solomon or Jonas (Matt. xii. 41 ff.); he wished to loosen the close tie which in the conception of the people connected the Messiah with David; and as it was upon this connection that all the worldly and political elements in the Jewish hope of the Messiah depended, we may look upon that expression of Jesus, if it really comes from him, as a disavowal of this element in the conception of the Messiah entertained by his countrymen.

The other current appellation of the Messiah, and which

was indeed his own peculiar title of dignity, found in the Gospels, is the name "Son of God." In the Old Testament the people of Israel had been so called (2 Mos. iv. 22 ff.; Hos. xi. 1; Ps. lxxx. 16), also rulers of this people, favourites of God, like David and Solomon (2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 27) and their worthy successors (Ps. ii. 7). Afterwards the term had become the regular title of the expected great ruler of the lineage of David, the Messiah, as we find it in the New Testament. Jesus is called so by the Devil, hypothetically, in the history of the Temptation (Matt. iv. 3, 6), and mockingly by the Jews under the cross (Matt. xxvii. 40, 43); the demons among the Gergesenes address him so (Matt. viii. 29), and other demoniacs (Mark iii. 11), and the people in the ship when he came walking over the sea (Matt. xiv. 33); God himself declares him to be so on the occasion of the baptism (Matt. iii. 17), and on the mount of transfiguration (Matt. xvii. 5); the High Priest on his trial questions him upon this point (Matt. xxvi. 63), and on this occasion the appellations of Son of God, and Christ or Messiah, are made expressly equivalent. Now Jesus did not, indeed, indirectly disavow this other title of the Messiah as he did that of the Son of David; but, if we leave the fourth Evangelist out of consideration, he never adopted it directly and on his own account. To the adjuring question of the High Priest as to whether he was Christ the Son of God, he answers, "Thou sayest it," *i.e.* affirming; and when Peter answered his question, For whom then, amidst such hesitating opinions of the people about him, do they, the disciples, take him, with the cheerful words, "For Christ the Son of the living God," he blessed him for it, and extolled this perception that had arisen in him as an immediate revelation of his heavenly Father (Matt. xvi. 15 ff.). But it is remarkable that he found it necessary immediately to suppress this notion. In all three Synoptics there follows immediately upon Peter's confession, first the command to tell no one

that he is the Messiah, and the first announcement of his Passion (Matt. xvi. 20 ff.; Mark viii. 30 ff.; Luke xi. 21 ff.). Does it not look as if Jesus intended to say to his disciples, "Yes, I am the Messiah, but not your royal Son of David; I am the Son of God, but he will glorify me, far otherwise than you think, by suffering and death"?*

One, therefore, of the two current titles of the Messiah, that of the Son of David, Jesus never uses of himself, and once even treats it almost ironically. The other, Son of God, he does indeed accept when it is offered to him, though not without a precaution against misapprehension. But the term by which he loves best to describe himself is that of Son of Man, and it is now a question very differently answered, and by no means so easy to answer as it seems to be, whether he intended thereby to designate himself as the Messiah or not.† From passages like Ps. viii. 5, Job xxv. 6, it is well known that the expression is used exactly synonymous with man, mortal; and also in the New Testament, in Mark iii. 28, it is found in this signification. Here, however, the accessory idea of humility and weakness, in opposition to undeserved grace on the part of God, or unwarrantable pretension on the part of man, is not to be mistaken.

* In the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, the Son, whom the Lord sends to his servants (the Prophets), (Matt. xxi. 37), is certainly to be understood of Jesus himself as the Messiah; but here this description flowed out of the story, and its meaning had first to be discovered by his hearers, independent of the fact that it is a question whether the parable is really by Jesus. The passage, Matt. xi. 25 ff., Luke xvi. 21 ff., has already been spoken of above; the mode in which Jesus here addresses God as his Father reminds us of the pattern prayer, in which he also taught his disciples to call upon the Father in these terms; but the particular relation into which he places himself to the Father passes beyond the synoptic idea of the Messiah in the direction of the tendency of the fourth Gospel, where Jesus repeatedly declares himself to be not merely the Son, but the only-begotten of God (v. 19 ff., vi. 40) in a sense which, in an historical consideration of the life of Jesus, we have been already compelled to reject.

† On what follows, compare Baur's treatise, "Meaning of the Expression, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*," in Hilgenfeld's Journal of Scientific Theology, III. 3, pp. 274—292.

But this accessory meaning comes out still more decidedly in Ezekiel, while at the same time the expression is not used to designate man or human nature generally, but one individual man. Here Jehovah addresses the prophet on the occasion of every successive vision which he presents to him, every new commission which he imparts to him, as Son of Man (ii. 1, 3, 6, 8, iii. 1, 3, 4, 10, 17, &c.); and, if we consider the situation in which he is so called for the first time, we see that the expression is chosen, in connection with the traditional usage of language, in order to bring out into relief the contrast between the weak human nature of the prophet and the lofty revelation of which he is thought worthy to be the subject. When, then, Jesus reminds one who offers to accompany him that the Son of Man has not where to lay his head (Matt. ix. 6); when he says that the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many (Matt. xx. 28); when he repeatedly describes the suffering and death that awaits him as something that must happen to the Son of Man (Matt. xii. 40, xvii. 12, 22, xx. 18, xxvi. 2), he might possibly entitle himself so only in the same sense in which Ezekiel represents himself as being so called by Jehovah, as one entrusted indeed by God with lofty revelations, but still a weak and humble mortal, who must therefore be prepared for every deprivation, for every discomfort. Also when he ascribes to himself, as the Son of Man, the power to forgive sins (Matt. ix. 6), and declares the Son of Man to be Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8), nay, even when in the parable of the Tares he explains the Sower of the good seed to be the Son of Man (Matt. xiii. 37), these passages, taken by themselves, might be understood to signify that Jesus meant nothing more than that he, a mortal man, had been charged by God with commissions so exalted.

But in the very last passage this explanation fails. For of that same Son of Man who sowed the good seed it is said further on (ver. 41), that he will, at the end of the world,

send forth his angels to separate the good from the bad, to reward the former and to punish the latter,—powers which, from the Jewish point of view, could be attributed, except Jehovah, to none but the Messiah. The Messiah must therefore at all events be meant in all these passages in which it is said of the Son of Man that he will hereafter come in his own or his Father's glory, or in his kingdom, and then he will sit upon his throne to hold judgment (Matt. x. 23, xvi. 27 ff., xix. 28, xxiv. 27, 37, 39, 44, xxv. 13, 31). If from these passages we see with certainty that the expression is intended to designate the Messiah, we may also learn from some others whence it got this meaning. When Jesus, as he does on several occasions, describes the coming of the Son of Man as a coming in the clouds of heaven (Matt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64; comp. Rev. i. 7), Ezekiel, with his title of Son of Man, offers nothing in explanation of this picture, but we find ourselves referred to Daniel (vii. 13), where, in the vision of the four beasts already spoken of, after the fall of the last of the beasts, one like the Son of Man comes before the throne of God, and is invested with everlasting dominion over all people; a passage which, if not meant originally of the Messiah, might easily be referred to him.

Then comes the question as to how early this explanation of the passage in Daniel, and consequently the designation of the Messiah as the Son of Man, became current among the Jews. Now, as was remarked above, as we have no further certain evidence upon this point,* we must endeavour to decide this question solely by passages in the Gospels themselves. Let it not be said that if Jesus used this expression in order to designate himself as the Messiah, it must have had this meaning already in the current language of his contemporaries. For it is still a question whether from the first he intended unequivocally to profess himself the Messiah;

* Compare above, Sect. 28. The Rabbinical appellation of the Messiah as "Cloud Man" (Anani) is, in any case, later.

if not, then it would be precisely a term, not yet the accepted title of the Messiah, which would serve him best. So little was this the case, if we follow the fourth Gospel, that the people in Jerusalem, on the declaration of Jesus that the Son of Man must be lifted up from the earth, put the question, "Who is this Son of Man?" (xii. 34). This is, indeed, only one of those fictitious questions founded on ignorance which occur in this Gospel; it appears also, even in the sense in which it is given by the Evangelist, to be half due to affectation on the part of the people, since, even according to what precedes, the people understood very well that it was the Messiah who was spoken of. But in Matthew also, Jesus asks the disciples the question, "Whom do the people say that I, the Son of Man, am?" adding the further question, "But whom do ye say that I am?" and the blessing of Peter because he had answered, The Messiah (Matt. xvi. 13 ff.)—all this, in such a connection, presupposes that Son of Man was not a current appellation of the Messiah,—nay, had not been even known as such to the disciples themselves. For, had it been so, Jesus, when he made that addition to his question, would have put the right answer into their mouths, and been unable afterwards to attribute a divine revelation to Peter's insight into the truth that he, whom he had hitherto known only under the title of Son of Man, was none other than the Messiah. If, then, the account of Matthew is correct, it was not then customary, as it afterwards became, to think of the passage in Daniel where the term Son of Man was used, but the disciples had up to that time understood it in the sense of Ezekiel, as a kind of formula of humility, in which Jesus spoke of himself as a weak receptacle of Divine Revelation.

But was this all he meant, or did he in himself, when he adopted the formula of Ezekiel, also think of the Man in the Clouds spoken of in Daniel? The answer to this question will depend upon the answer to another, which is, whether those passages in which he speaks of the coming of the Son

of Man in the clouds, in his glory, in his kingdom, and generally of a future return in superhuman form, are to be considered as genuine or not. And this is a point which must be discussed hereafter. Meanwhile we content ourselves with asking what motive could Jesus have for choosing as the description of himself just that expression which was not yet in general use, as the description of the Messiah? The most valid motive would certainly have been that he had not yet at the beginning of his public ministry believed himself to be the Messiah. And this explanation would agree with the view enunciated above, that the prophetic consciousness arose in him before the Messianic. But it is also conceivable that Jesus, though already fully convinced of his own Messiahship, did nevertheless, in reference to others, select, to designate himself, an expression not yet stamped as a title of the Messiah, in order not to force anything from without upon his disciples and the people, but to allow of the conviction that he was the Messiah arising spontaneously within them; hence, also, his visible rejoicing when he had got so far, at least with his nearest friends, that he saw the germ of the right view of his character springing up in the mind of one of them.

He might feel himself induced to choose this method the more he must have feared, by declaring himself from the first to be the Messiah, to excite all those political hopes of the nation which ran directly counter to that sense in which alone he thought of being the Messiah. And the description of him as Son of Man agreed with this sense in a remarkable manner. In contrast with the Messiah as Son of God, and all the miracle-seeking fanaticism connected with the idea, it contained the element of meekness and humility, of the human and natural; in contrast with the Messiah as Son of David, and the taint of national pride, the spirit of exclusiveness and political expectations attaching to this notion, the other appellation was characterised by universality, humanity,

and morality. The Son of Man has not where to lay his head; he came not to be ministered to, but to minister; he will be delivered into the hands of men, be ill-treated, and put to death: how far removed was such a career as this from the glorious path of a Son of God! It is the Son of Man who sows the good seed of the word; he has the power of forgiving sin on earth; he makes it his business to seek and to save that which is lost: what a different calling from that which the Jew was accustomed to attribute to his Son of David! For some time Jesus followed this calling before the eyes of his disciples and his nation; he exhibited himself as the Son of Man and the Friend of man, who regarded nothing human as too petty for him, nothing human as foreign to his interests, who as little despised innocent human joys as he turned away from the sorrows of human life when they lay in the path of his calling. And it was not until he had done all this that it appeared to him to be time to drop the veil, and to assume the title of Messiah, at least before his friends. But even then, as is proved by his command to the disciples not to publish their conviction of his Messiahship (supposing this to be historical, and not invented merely to exaggerate the impression of the humility of Jesus, after Isaiah xlii. 1 ff.; comp. Matt. xii. 16 ff.), he did not yet consider the people ripe to understand the sense in which he wished to be the Messiah. And the announcement of his suffering to come, which he connects with his acquiescence in the Messiah-title, shews that he did not think he could impress it too strongly on the minds of his disciples not to forget, in the element of the Son of God, that of the Son of Man existing in him.

Baur* distinguishes two factors in the self-consciousness of Jesus—one universal and human, the essence of which was the pure moral relation between God and man, true in itself

* The Tübingen School, 2nd edition, p. 30 ff. Compare Christianity of the Three First Centuries, p. 35 ff.

and free from all false means of operation, and an exclusive national factor, formed by the Jewish idea of the Messiah: he considers the first as the infinite ideal essence which must enter into this last limited form, in order to attain historical fixity, and be able to be communicated to the world. Now this is, indeed, in itself perfectly correct, only it sounds as if Jesus, while his own personal conviction was gravitating to the first side, had merely accommodated himself to the idea of the Jewish Messiah. Baur certainly did not mean this. He knew as well as any one that with a personality of such immeasurable historical effect as that of Jesus obviously was, there cannot be a question of adaptation, of playing a part, of, as it were, any sort of vacant space in the consciousness not filled with the impelling idea—that with such a personality every item must have been conviction. But this does not appear in the form in which he puts it, and so far the expression of Schleiermacher is a happier one, that from his own inmost self-consciousness Jesus must have come to the conviction that in the Messianic prophecies in the Holy Scriptures of his nation no one else can have been meant but he.

To such a conviction Jesus might be brought the sooner, as, according to the former analysis, these prophecies, *i.e.* those passages in the Old Testament which were at that time referred to the Messiah, whether rightly or wrongly, did themselves contain two component parts distinguishable as real and ideal, religious-political and religious-moral. The movement that had been excited in the Jewish people by the first component element had on every occasion only led to harm. The years of the infancy of Jesus were coincident with the rebellion of Judas the Gaulonite or Galilean against the Roman census (Acts v. 37), which ended as unfortunately as all attempts of the Jews, whether earlier or later, to resist the Roman power: although fanatical adherents of the fundamental principles of this Judas were in existence until the latest period of the Jewish state, and were creating disturb-

ances in it. But in all these rebellions the idea of the Messiah, politically understood, constituted the real motive, as the fanatics, believing that Jehovah alone was the legitimate Monarch of the chosen people, and would at the appointed time send in the person of the Messiah one visibly anointed for their salvation, refused allegiance to any other ruler. It is self-evident that experiences of this kind of the destructive effect of the political element in the Messianic prophecies, must have inclined a mind of the ideal tendency of that of Jesus more decisively to their other religious moral side. What others considered only as a condition of the coming of salvation by the Messiah, the elevation, namely, of the people to genuine piety and morality, he considered as the main thing. His opinion was not that as a reward for their improvement Jehovah would miraculously invert the relations of the world, make the Jews a ruling people, subject their former oppressors to them, and endow them with all fulness of external goods and sensual enjoyments, but that in that spiritual and moral elevation, that new relation to God, no longer that of slaves to a master, but of children to a father, they would find a happiness desirable in itself, but including at the same time the natural germs of all external and material amendment. In this sense they were above everything to seek the kingdom of God, and so should all other things be added to them (Matt. vi. 33).

38. THE TEACHING AND THE SUFFERING MESSIAH.

It is true indeed that the Messiah was described by the Messianic prophecies principally as a powerful King, in accordance with the idea which took its rise from the yearning which the people felt for the return of a period of national happiness like that under David. But those passages also were referred to him in which not a military but a peaceful

ruler—nay, only a prophet—was spoken of, whom God would send to his people. And thus, according to explanations given above, there were really Messianic passages in which, together with victory over the enemy, the introduction at the same time of a better tone of mind among the people was expected by them.

But while on Jewish soil the features of the warrior and the monarch, originally identified with the idea of the Messiah, never entirely disappeared, there was likewise included in the Old Testament, in a different conception of that personage, an element by which, in the sequel, that idea might be subsequently modified, and a Teacher and Sufferer be substituted in the place of the powerful Ruler. It is evident that the servant of Jehovah alluded to in the latter portion of Isaiah, had originally nothing to do with the Messiah. It is expressly the seed of Abraham, the people of Israel, that Jehovah here (Isaiah xli. 8 ff., xlv. 1 ff., 21, xlv. 4, xviii. 20) names his servant, whom he called from the ends of the earth and chose, and whom he will not abandon nor reject. Scattered, during the captivity, among strange and idolatrous nations, and thereby only confirmed in its adherence to the religion of Jehovah, the Israelitish people appeared to itself as the chosen servant of the true God; and according to the two sides of mutual operation upon which it entered among the people among whom it had fallen, it was at one time the teacher of them, at another their victim.

On the one side, in this case also as in that of the idea of the Messiah, the military desire of vengeance appears: Jehovah will bring the nations who have oppressed and abused his servant to shame and to nothing; but the people of Israel he will make a new sharp threshing instrument, crushing everything to pieces (xlv. 11 ff., 15). But with all this the people during the captivity had become conscious at the same time not merely of the high superiority of their religion above the Babylonian Chaldaic, but also of the power of

attraction which, notwithstanding the aversion generally felt towards them, they still, in particular cases, exercised over the better spirits of other nations; hence they adopted as their calling the dissemination of the religion of Jehovah among other nations: the servant of God upon whom he had laid his spirit is called to be the light of the nations, the preacher of truth and justice upon earth; and in this he, having learnt in captivity patience and resignation, will still proceed patiently and quietly and will not faint, until he has reached his end, and satisfied the conditions of his exalted calling (xlii. 1 ff.).

With this lofty calling the Israelitish people during the captivity was given up to the ill-treatment of the overpowering heathen; Jacob was a worm, an imprisoned people (xli. 14, xlii. 22); but not because Jehovah had rejected him, but only because God wished to punish him for his unfaithfulness, and by that punishment to bring him to conversion, in order then to pardon him his misdeeds (xlii. 23 ff., xliii. 21 ff.). Or, according to a bolder view of the course of events, the people of Israel had atoned not so much for itself as for other people (or its better nucleus, which had remained true to Jehovah, for the corrupt and separated masses), the punishment which should have fallen upon the ungodly nations, and the portion of Israel which had become like them had been laid by Jehovah upon his servant, who now for such mediatorial suffering borne with patient submission awaited an indemnification, all the more glorious, in a return to his own country and restoration of his political condition.

It is indeed true that in this section of the later appendix to Isaiah all this is expressed in terms applying to a person only (as sickness, wounds, death, and burial), with interchange, in a style of prophetic boldness, of the persons addressing and addressed, and also, in more places than one, in very mysterious words. So much is this the case, that it is necessary to keep well in hand the thread obtained at first in the express

comparison between the servant of Jehovah and the people of Israel. Otherwise there will be a danger of losing it, of being misled into the error of supposing that in some passages, and in particular in that principal passage contained in chapters lii. and liii., an individual subject, distinct from the people, must be meant by the servant of Jehovah. Nevertheless, the learned Jew was perfectly right when, in opposition to the Father of the Church and his Christian interpretation of the passage, he maintained that in that passage the Jewish people are spoken of as a collective whole, which in the captivity was scattered and chastised in order to make the more proselytes.* The Greek translation also of the so-called Seventy interpreters thus understood the expression, *Servant of God*, from first to last. In xlii. 1, where all that appears in the original text is, *My servant, my chosen*, they put "*Jacob my servant*," "*Israel my chosen*," and give a similar turn to the passage, xlix. 3.

It is well known that in the New Testament a different meaning is given to this section, and that which is said of the servant of God, instead of being referred to the people of Israel, is referred to Christ. The classical passage is in the Acts, viii. 34 ff., where the Ethiopian eunuch asks Philip, the gospel preacher, whether in the words of Isaiah liii. 7 ff., "*He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth*," the prophet speaks of himself or of another? upon which Philip takes occasion from the passage to preach to him Jesus as the suffering Messiah here prophesied. So also in the Gospels, in the crucifixion of Jesus between two malefactors, there is discovered a fulfilment of Isaiah liii. 12, "*He was numbered among the transgressors*" (Matthew xv. 28 ff.; comp. Luke xxii. 37); in the noiseless ministration of Jesus, the fulfilment of the prophecy of the servant of God who

* Orig. c. Cels. i. 55.

does not cry nor lift up his voice (Isaiah xlii. 1—4; Matt. xii. 18 ff.); in the healing of the sick by Jesus, the fulfilment of the expression of Isaiah liii. 4 (Matt. viii. 17). In the last case, the words of the prophet are garbled, as he is speaking, not of the Son of God removing or putting away, but taking upon himself, the infirmities of others; as in 1 Peter ii. 22—24, the passage in Isaiah liii. 4—6 is applied in this sense to the mediatorial suffering of Jesus.

Jesus is said to have referred to himself the prophecies about the servant of God in the appendix to Isaiah, when after his last supper (Luke xxii. 37), before the departure to the Mount of Olives, he said to his disciples that this also must be fulfilled in him, "And he was numbered among the transgressors." But this is by no means proved by the passage in question. For the one Evangelist appears to have put directly into the mouth of Jesus words which the other (Mark xv. 28) gives as a quotation on his own account. We are left in the same uncertainty, and for a similar reason, by the narrative in Luke iv. 16 ff., in which Jesus is said to have taken the passage in Isaiah lxi. 1 ff., and applied it to himself. But in this passage the servant of God is not spoken of, but the prophet is speaking in his own name of the joyful message which he has to proclaim to the poor and the captives. Again, it is said of Jesus after his resurrection, that he taught the disciples out of the Scriptures, and especially out of the prophets, that the Messiah must suffer and die in order to enter into his glory (Luke xxiv. 25 ff., 44 ff.). In this case it is true that the whole of this section of Isaiah is alluded to, but the alleged speeches of Jesus after his resurrection are not adapted to serve as a support for an historical proof.

Meanwhile, a system of interpretation developed itself among the Jews at a later period, which discovered the Messiah in the servant of Jehovah spoken of in Isaiah. There was no question that in the Old Testament, not merely

the people of God, but also Moses and other men of God, especially David, were called servants of Jehovah (Ps. xviii. 1, xxxvi. 1, lxxxix. 4, 21), and it was obvious to transfer the distinguishing appellation from these persons to the Messiah. Thus the so-called Targum Jonathan, a Chaldee paraphrase of a portion of the books of the Old Testament, the author of which is generally believed to have lived about the time of the birth of Christ, makes the passage in Isaiah lii. 53 allude to the Messiah. In doing so, indeed, he shrinks from the peculiar characteristics of the suffering, and evades them in every instance. He interprets the astonishment at the miserable appearance of the servant of Jehovah, to mean the expectation of his coming; he changes his mediatorial suffering into a mere intercession; the uncomeliness of his countenance he turns aside, by explaining it to mean the miseries of the people in the captivity. There are, in fact, in the enunciations of the later Isaiah about the servant of Jehovah, two elements to be distinguished from one another, towards which, from the standpoint of the conception of the Jewish Messiah, a correspondingly different position would be assumed. The profession of Teacher ascribed to him might be combined with it, as the idea of that profession had something corresponding to it in that conception; but the suffering, the character of Martyr, appeared irreconcilable with the character of King and Hero which the common conception gave to the Messiah, and therefore the evasions of the Targum in order to escape from the former may easily be understood.

But it is very probable that the conception of the calling of the Messiah formed by Jesus himself, readily admitted characteristics of the former description. Nay, it is probable that characteristics such as are found in Isaiah xlii. 1 ff., of the unpretending but persevering ministry as a Teacher on the part of the servant of Jehovah, incorporated by Jesus in the idea of the Messiah, contributed in no small degree towards

making this idea appear applicable to himself. And here it is especially observable how the description of Light of the Heathen applied to the servant of Jehovah (Isaiah xlii. 6, xlix. 6) might from the very first contribute towards enlarging the range of view of Jesus beyond the limits of the Jewish people. But patience is inseparable from the Teacher's calling; the indefatigable Teacher must also accept ingratitude as part of his bargain, and overcome obstinacy by endurance; in the history of the Hebrew prophets there were instances of several of them having sealed their faith in the religion of Jehovah, preached by them and maintained by them, by the martyr's death. And thus there naturally resulted an approximation also towards these characteristics in the image of the servant of Jehovah which contained peculiar suffering, torment, and ill-usage even unto death. It is possible that from the first Jesus clung most or exclusively to the characteristics of the first description, that he wished to be the Messiah in the sense of the calm and patient Teacher, but the more among his own people he met with want of sympathy and with resistance, the more he saw the hatred of the upper ranks excited against him, the more occasion had he to adopt into the conception of the Messiah he had formed the peculiar characteristics in Isaiah l. lii. liii., after the example of the earlier prophets (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xviii. 33 ff.), to prepare not only himself, but his followers, to submit to the utmost to oppression, condemnation, and execution. He might also have adopted from Isaiah liii. the contemplation of surrendering his life "a ransom for many" (Matt. xx. 28), and of his death as an atoning sacrifice. For these ideas, in their general form, approached very nearly to the Jewish range of thought.

It is very probable, on historical grounds, that our three first Evangelists knew nothing of these announcements of suffering to come until quite a late period, shortly before the entrance of Jesus upon the eventful journey to Jerusalem

(Matt. xvi. 21 ff., xvii. 12, 22 ff., xx. 17 ff., 22, 28, and the parallel passages). Quite as improbable, in the Gospel of John, are the predictions of his suffering and death put into the mouth, not only of Jesus himself, from the very beginning of his ministry (ii. 19 ff., iii. 14), but of the Baptist as well, before the public appearance of Jesus (i. 29, 36). The expressions, indeed, in this Gospel by which Jesus foretells his own death, are in less definite terms than those in the Synoptics. But this circumstance gives no superiority to the representation of John, because, supposing Jesus to have really spoken of an exaltation of the Son of Man after the manner of the brazen serpent (John iii. 14, xii. 32), he must have been as conscious beforehand of his own death upon the cross as when, according to the Synoptics, he spoke directly of it, though not until a much later period. More definite characteristics, as, in particular, the announcement that his death will be effected by means of crucifixion, are from the sequel introduced into the speeches of Jesus; others, as for example the spitting (Luke xviii. 32), were taken from the prophecy of Isaiah, l. 6, whether by Jesus, or, as is more probably the case, by the Evangelist.

There is also every probability in favour of the fact that the first revelation of this kind which Jesus made to his disciples was most displeasing and repulsive to them. Thus Matthew (xvi. 22) informs us that Peter exclaimed, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee!" For they shared the common conception of the Messiah, which up to this time Jesus had attempted rather to modify indirectly and virtually than to combat expressly, and to this conception, suffering, and the death of the criminal, formed the most glaring contrast. And however Jesus might now censure the worldly mind of Peter, and angrily repudiate the Apostle's speech against his purposed suffering as an attempt of Satan to turn him from the right way, take also every opportunity of pointing out to the disciples the inevitability

of such a result, still this result might have come upon them before they had familiarised themselves with the thought of it, and thus at the first moment have disheartened them as much as if they had not been prepared for it.

The case is somewhat different with the prediction of his resurrection after three days, which the Evangelists represent Jesus as connecting regularly with the announcement of his death. As regards the Resurrection, as may be here preliminarily remarked, one of three alternatives is possible. It may be considered either as a miraculous event, or as a natural and material one, or as a belief that arose without any objective fact corresponding to it. In the last case, if it did not take place, so neither can it have been predicted by Jesus; quite as little in the second, as an accident not to be previously reckoned on; in the first, the prediction would be, not indeed a greater miracle than the event itself, but by both the connection of natural causes and effects would be so interrupted that the assumption of them as true would be equivalent to an abandonment of the historical consideration of the life of Jesus, and, as this is what we have undertaken, inadmissible by us. In the passage, indeed, of the suffering servant of Jehovah, cut off from the land of the living and having his grave with the wicked, it is said, that after he has given up his life for an offering for sin, he shall see his posterity and live long (Isaiah liii. 10); and if Jesus saw in himself the servant of Jehovah, then it is conceivable that he might have applied this characteristic also to himself in the sense of a miraculous resurrection, and from this point of view have expected to rise from the dead, and prophesied that he should do so, to which, after the result, the definite time of three days would be added. But the feature of the "Descendants," as well as that which follows further on (ver. 12), that he should divide the spoil with the strong, must have made it necessary for him to take the whole passage, if it was to be applicable to him, only in a symbolical sense, and

to understand it either of reward and glorification in the future life, or, as is said, ver. 10, of the success of the purpose of Jehovah in his hand, *i.e.* of the future success of his cause. It is only therefore in some such figurative sense as this, and not in that of a literal resurrection of his slain body, that Jesus, if the history of his life is to be historically considered, could have spoken of his future resurrection.

39. THE SECOND ADVENT OF THE MESSIAH.

But he speaks in the Gospels, not only of his resurrection on the third day, but also of the coming of the Son of Man, *i.e.* of his own second coming at a later though not a distant period, when he will appear in the clouds of heaven, in divine glory and accompanied by angels, to awake the dead, to judge the quick and the dead, and to open his kingdom, the kingdom of God or heaven (Matt. x. 23, xiii. 41, xvi. 27 ff., xxiv. 27 ff., xxv. 31 ff.; comp. vii. 22 ff.; John v. 28 ff., vi. 29 ff.).

Here we stand face to face with a decisive point. The ancient Church clung to this part of the doctrine of Jesus in its literal signification,—nay, it was, properly speaking, built upon this foundation, since without the expectation of a near return of Christ no Christian Church whatever would have come into existence. For us, on the contrary, Jesus has either no existence at all, or exists only as a human being. To a human being no such thing as he here prophesied of himself could happen. If he did prophesy it of himself, and expect it himself, he is for us nothing but a fanatic; if, without any conviction on his own part, he said it of himself, he was a braggart and an impostor. There is only a trifling difference between this and the pretended utterances of Jesus about his pre-existence. He who thinks he remembers his former existence anterior to his birth (not merely, like Plato, con-

sidering certain ideas already existing in his mind to be recollections of a former state of existence), which no other human being remembers, nor he himself either, is in our opinion nothing but a madman: he who expects to come again after his death, as no human being ever has done, is in our opinion not exactly a madman, because in reference to the future imagination is more possible, but still an arrant enthusiast.

In what was said above we were able completely to relieve Jesus of all responsibility on the score of the speeches about his supposed pre-existence, not by contradicting the clear meaning of the words, and garbling them into an unnatural sense, but by considering that he only utters them in that Gospel, the composer of which describes to us, not the real Jesus, but only the Jesus of his own imagination. The case is more doubtful with the speeches of Jesus about his second coming. We find them in all four Gospels,—nay, we find them in the three first, which we acknowledge as the repository of much genuine historical tradition, at greater length, and more definite, than in the fourth. What, then, is here to be done? Are we in this case to put up with a modification of the meaning of these speeches into an unnatural explanation? Or shall we be able to make it probable that Jesus did not utter them at all? Or, lastly, shall we make him bear the burden of them in the full meaning of the words, and therefore be compelled to admit that he was a fanatic, and not a common one either? In this case we should by no means exclude this latter supposition as something altogether inconceivable.

With our Christian habits of thought, it might be bitter to our taste; but if it came out as an historical result, our habits would have to give way. Nor should it be said that a fanatic would not have produced the historical effects which Jesus did produce, would not have had the sound and lofty views which, up to this point, have been analysed. This may be

true of an impostor, and this character, therefore, we leave entirely out of the question. But it is no unusual phenomenon to see high spiritual gifts and moral endowments tempered with an ingredient of enthusiasm, and of the great men of history it might even be absolutely maintained that not one of them would have existed without enthusiasm.

According to the evangelical accounts, Jesus considered his second advent so near that he said to his disciples, that there were some among those standing round him who should not taste of death until they had seen the Son of Man coming in his kingdom (Matt. xvi. 28); that this generation shall not pass away until this has taken place, *i.e.* until the second advent of the Son of Man, with all its preparatory and attendant circumstances, shall have occurred (Matt. xxiv. 34). In particular he represented this last catastrophe as occurring immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem, prophesied by him just before (Matt. xxiv. 34). And in any case he was greatly mistaken with reference to the date, for not only has that generation passed away, but for 1800 years one generation after another has done so likewise without his predicted second advent having taken place. But all this, on our point of view, does not make the case at all worse. For in order to see that the prophecy of a man's return in the clouds is something utterly groundless, we do not require experience of its not having happened at a certain time. So much the less can we feel ourselves tempted to one of the violent explanations which the theologians have here taken up, in a regular conflict with the words of the text, understanding by the generation which should not pass away till all had come to pass, sometimes the Jewish people, sometimes the Christian Church, or by the "all" which should come to pass first, only the destruction of Jerusalem, or by the "being accomplished," only the first beginning of the events in the midst of the course of which we are at present living.

But also by the coming of Jesus himself, of which he speaks in these passages, we cannot, if his words are rightly reported to us, understand an invisible and gradual development, *i.e.* the natural development of the effects of his action upon earth, but only one visible and sudden, a miraculous catastrophe. Even in the case of previous executions of divine vengeance upon particular nations, the prophets had spoken of darkening of the sun and moon and falling of the stars (Isaiah xiii. 10, xxxiv. 4; Joel iii. 4, iv. 15; Amos viii. 9). But this does not prove that features of this kind were only to be taken in a non-literal sense, as, on the contrary, those prophets did expect real natural phenomena of this kind as signs and accompanying circumstances of those historical events. But when Jesus in the principal passage in Matthew (xxiv. 30 ff., xxv. 31 ff.) says that after those occurrences in the stars the sign of the Son of Man will appear in the heavens, then amid the lamentation of all nations of the earth the Son of Man will be seen coming on the clouds with great power and glory, he will send out his angels with a loud-sounding trumpet, in order to gather his elect from all the four winds, then sit upon his throne to judge all men, to make some go into everlasting fire, others into everlasting life—such a description resists every attempt to give it a merely symbolical meaning, and as the Christian Church always understood it in the literal meaning of the words, so it was also certainly meant by Jesus, if it was really given by him.

It cannot indeed be overlooked that the speeches referring to this point have undergone later modifications of various kinds. On one occasion Jesus says to his disciples that the Son of Man will return before they shall have completed their Messianic preaching in all the cities of Israel (Matt. x. 23); another time he says that the second advent will not occur until the gospel has been preached in the whole world among all peoples (Matt. xxiv. 14). Now these are two very

different things; Jesus, therefore, must have changed his views very much between the first of these prophecies and the second, or rather it is clear that the one was put into the mouth of Jesus at a time when, and in a circle in which, the kingdom of the Messiah was considered limited to the people of Israel, and the other from a point of view to which the calling of the heathen into that kingdom was already a settled thing. It is evident that there are many features in the long speech on the second advent (Matt. xxiv.; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi.) which were not introduced into it until a considerable time after the death of Jesus. The famine and earthquake, the war and rumours of war, the rising of nation against nation and kingdom against kingdom, which are to precede the end, *i.e.* the destruction of Jerusalem, may be accurately shewn to refer to the time of Claudius and Nero, as described in the corresponding books of the Annals of Tacitus and Antiquities and Jewish War of Josephus.* It cannot be overlooked that in the maltreatment and slaughtering of Christians by Jewish and heathen authorities (Matt. xxiv. 9; Mark xiii. 9; Luke xxi. 12), the first persecutions of the Christians in Jerusalem, and the great persecutions under Nero, are alluded to. The hatred of all nations against the Christians (Matt. v. 9) appears in the Roman historian† as the alleged hatred of the Christians against the whole human race. The "waxing cold" of love in the Church in consequence of the abounding of iniquity (Matt. v. 12) reminds us of the reproach which the author of the Apocalypse (ii. 4) utters against the church at Ephesus, of having left its first love. And there is a most remarkable coincidence between the description of the false prophets and claimants to be the Messiah in the speech of Jesus (Matt. xxiv. 5, xi. 23—26), and particular occurrences of a later time. To these belongs the appearance of that Theudas

* Comp. especially, Köstlin's Essay, "Origin and Composition of the Synoptic Gospels," p. 18 ff.

† Tacit. Annal. xv. 44.

in the reign of Claudius, of whom it is related in Acts (v. 36), only with a wrong date, that under the pretence of being something remarkable, *i.e.* a prophet, or even the Messiah himself, he collected round him nearly 400 men; of the so-called Egyptian prophet, whom the Roman tribune in Jerusalem took the Apostle Paul to be (Acts xxi. 38), who, as a second Moses, marched from Egypt through the wilderness, purposing, like a second Joshua, to sack Jerusalem without a blow, and is said, according to Josephus, to have drawn to him 30,000 men; of others, of whom Josephus says that, under the pretence of divine inspiration, they laboured to produce innovation and overthrow of governments, and excited the people to frenzy.* And in all this it is a very singular coincidence, that as Jesus (Matt. v. 26) cautions his followers, when one shall say to them that the Messiah is in the wilderness, not to believe them, so Josephus says, not only of the Egyptian, but of various other false prophets of these later times, and even of one who came for the destruction of Jerusalem, that they enticed the people into the wilderness by promising to shew them great miracles there.

The description also of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem, with its consequences, is evidently, at least in Luke (xxi. 20, 24; comp. xix. 43 ff.), who speaks of the investment of the town by a wall and army, of its desolation, and of the scattering of the captive Jews among all nations, taken from what really happened on and after the destruction by Titus. And even the general terms in which Matthew and Mark say (xxiv. 2, xiii. 2) that the Temple shall be destroyed to the foundations, appear in a peculiar light when compared with the Apocalypse. This book does not speak (xi. 1 ff., 13) of any destruction of the Temple, and even of the town it represents only a tenth as falling in consequence of an earthquake, and 7000 men losing their lives from the same cause. Now this statement is indeed, supposing the genuineness of

* Jewish War, ii. 13, 4; x. 7, 11, 2; Antiquities, xx. 5, i. 8, 6.

these speeches of Jesus, particularly unintelligible on the assumption that the Book of Revelation is the work of the Apostle John; but even if it is only admitted, as it must be, to be the work of a Jewish Christian of the time of Galba, it is difficult to understand how a person of this description could vary so much from so definite and detailed a prophecy of Jesus if it was in existence. There is, accordingly, every probability that these prophecies of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem originated in the circles of Jewish Christianity, and not until the time when the siege was going on and after the result of it, and then put into the mouth of Jesus in order to put him on an equality in this respect with the prophets of the Old Testament and with Daniel especially, who was in those times so much read and so extensively applied.

All this, however, does not touch the point itself with which we are here concerned. The prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem and the occurrences preceding it may have been put into the mouth of Jesus at a later period, or they may not. He may, nevertheless, still have spoken of his immediate return in the clouds, and might have expected this with all the more certainty after the destruction of Jerusalem when it had not occurred before.

Jesus promised to return again in his kingdom (Matt. xvi. 28). And now the question is, how he spoke on other occasions of this kingdom, especially whether he represented it as the same as that which he founded during his human existence, or as that which he would open on the occasion of his second advent, and not before. When, like the Baptist, he preached originally only the nearness of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. iv. 17); when he taught his followers to pray, "Thy kingdom come" (Matt. vi. 9), this kingdom was one which was not yet there, but had to come. And on another occasion he says that not all who say to him, Lord, Lord, shall come into the kingdom of heaven, and postpones the deci-

sion as to those who shall be admitted into it until "that day," *i.e.* the judgment-day to be held some time by him (Matt. vii. 21 ff.). And at the last supper he says to his disciples that he will not drink again of the fruit of the vine until he shall drink it with them new in the kingdom of his Father (Matt. xxvi. 29), in which, on another occasion, he will make those who have come from East and West to sit down at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt. viii. 11). From this it is still more decidedly evident that he expected the realisation of this kingdom, not in this period of the world, but in another, to be introduced by God in a supernatural manner.

On the other hand, however, he says that from the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force (Matt. xi. 12), or, as it is in Luke (xvi. 16), since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. Then, in answer to the accusation of the Pharisees, that he drives out devils by Beelzebub, he points out that he does it, on the contrary, by the Spirit of God, and therefore that the kingdom of heaven is already among them (Matt. xii. 28). To the question, again, of the Pharisees, as to when the kingdom of God shall come, he makes answer that it does not come in an external perceptible manner, but is within them (or already among them) (Luke xvii. 21). In these passages the kingdom of God is represented as that which is already here present, that has been founded and opened by Jesus during his life on earth. If, moreover, we compare the parables of the Grain of Mustard-seed, and particularly of the Leaven (Matt. xiii. 31 ff.), where the kingdom of heaven upon earth is compared with the gradual leavening of a mass of dough, then Jesus appears to have contemplated a perfectly natural and gradual development of that kingdom.

One view, however, does not quite exclude the other. In the parable of the Tares in the field (Matt. xiii. 24 ff.), a

gradual growing up of the good as well as the bad seed is spoken of, and afterwards a sudden separation of them when the harvest comes, and this harvest is referred to the end of the world. Assume that by both the course which the kingdom of God is to take is intended to be represented. Then the time of its gradual growing up during the present period of this world, when it exists not purely in itself, but mixed up in many ways with the world, is to be distinguished from the time of its perfection in the future Messianic period of the world, which will begin with the separation of the bad from the good. In exactly the same way, Matthew (xxviii. 20) represents Jesus, on the occasion of his last separation from his disciples, as assuring them that he will be with them always until the end of the present period of the world; but this end had been before (xxiv. 3) made coincident with Jesus' second advent; so that here likewise an invisible presence of Jesus must be distinguished from his visible second coming, as in the former case the presence of the kingdom of God, in an imperfect condition of preparation and development, from its perfect realisation in the future.

Jesus separated from the present as a time of preparation a future as that of perfection, from this life as a period of service a life to come as that of recompence, and with the beginning of this perfection he connected a change in the world to be brought about by God. This appears not only in all the Gospels in the most decided manner, if these are to be supposed to have any historical validity whatever, but we may assume also that it would be so from mere historical analogy. This was not merely one of the notions prevalent among the countrymen of Jesus, like that of a Messiah with temporal power, of which he had got rid; but in its fundamental principle it was the form under which alone the whole of antiquity, in so far as it had attained to a recognition of something supersensual, could contemplate the development of the world, in which therefore Platonism and Judaism met

each other. But if Jesus had once attained to this conviction, as of course he had, if he distinguished between this present earthly existence and a future one in the kingdom of God, whether in heaven or on the renovated earth, and if he conceived of the opening of the latter as a miraculous act of God, then it is indifferent in what nearer or more distant period he placed this act, and it would be nothing more than a human error if he expected it after the shortest possible delay, and announced this expectation for the consolation of his followers. Moreover, we cannot tell whether his followers, in the troubles and distress after his first departure, may not have consoled themselves by putting into his mouth prophecies of this kind of a near approach of the more blessed constitution of the world.

In all these speeches there is only one point that creates a difficulty, and that is, that Jesus should have connected with his own person that miraculous change, the beginning of the ideal state of recompence, that he should have declared himself to be the Being who will come with the clouds of heaven in the company of angels, in order to waken the dead and to hold judgment. The expectation of such a thing on one own's behalf is something quite different from a general expectation of it, and he who expects it of himself and for himself will not only appear to us in the light of a fanatic, but we see also an unallowable self-exaltation in a man's (and it is only of a human being that we are everywhere speaking) so putting himself above every one else as to contrast himself with them as their future Judge. And in doing so, Jesus must have completely forgotten how he had on one occasion disclaimed the epithet of good as one belonging to God alone.

If, indeed, Jesus was convinced that he was the Messiah, and referred the prophecy in Daniel to the Messiah, he must have expected, in accordance with it, some time or other to come with the clouds of heaven. The judgment, indeed, if we

examine the passage carefully, is represented in it as being held, not by the Son of Man coming in the clouds, but by the Ancient of days, *i.e.* by Jehovah himself. And also in the Revelation of John (xx. 11 ff.) it is God sitting upon his throne who appears, after the old Hebrew manner, as the Judge. Meanwhile we find the Apostle Paul appealing to the notion, as one traditional in the primeval church, of the saints, *i.e.* the Christians, being about to judge the world, even the angels themselves (1 Cor. vi. 2 ff.). And in the Synoptics, Jesus promises to the Twelve, as his assessors, the office of judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30). Thus it might well be that, together with the conception of Jehovah as the sole Judge of all, that of the transference of the office of Judge to the Messiah as his representative, might have been in existence even before the time of Jesus, and only have been adopted by him as an appendage to the conception of the Messiah. He had preached the word of God to mankind, and according to that word they were to be judged. If this was so, the natural inference was, that the preacher of the word himself would have a principal part in that judgment to come; it was for him who had sown the good seed, at some future time to commission his angels, when the harvest came, to root out and burn the tares (Matt. xiii. 37, 41). In the fourth Gospel, certainly, Jesus disclaims for his own person the office of Judge, and ascribes it only to the Word which he had preached (John xii. 47); but this turn is given to the question by the Evangelist in consequence of his idea of the Logos, which excluded everything of a negative character, all condemnation and destruction, and we cannot therefore assume it as a proof against the genuineness of the Synoptic speeches of Jesus about the judgment.

40. THEATRE AND DURATION OF THE PUBLIC MINISTRY
OF JESUS.

If, now, we examine the mode in which Jesus worked for the planting of the kingdom of God upon earth, Matthew (iv. 23, ix. 35) says that he travelled about in the whole of Galilee, in all towns and villages, taught in the synagogues, and proclaimed the glad tidings of the kingdom of heaven; and Luke (xxiii. 5) represents the accusers of Jesus in Jerusalem as saying to Pilate that he stirs up the people by his teaching, which he begun in Galilee and continued through Judea up to Jerusalem. It is the life of a wandering Teacher which the Evangelists here and everywhere attribute to Jesus: he has, indeed, his own particular residence in the town of Capernaum on the sea of Galilee, the home of his most eminent disciples (Matt. iv. 13, viii. 5, 14, ix. 1; comp. xi. 23; Luke iv. 23), but he travels mostly accompanied by a number of confidential disciples, and some opulent women who provided for the material wants of the society (Luke viii. 1—3, xxiii. 49; Matt. xxvii. 55 ff.; Mark xv. 40 ff.). He passes through the country, where he sometimes appears on the Sabbath in the synagogues (Matt. xii. 9, xiii. 53; Mark i. 21, iii. 1, vi. 2; Luke iv. 16, 31, 33, vi. 6, xiii. 10; John vi. 59); sometimes speaks to great multitudes of the people in the open air from heights above (Matt. v. 1), or on the shore of the lake from out of the ship (Matt. xiii. 1 ff.; Mark ii. 13, iii. 7 ff., iv. 1; Luke x. 1 ff.), exhorts the people in the Temple at Jerusalem, and disputes with the Doctors (Matt. xxi. 23, xxiii. 39; Mark xi. 27, xii. 43; Luke xx. 21; John vii. 14, viii. 20, 59, x. 22 ff.), is heard speaking with learning and edification in houses which he enters by hospitable invitation or from a relation of permanent friendship (Matt. ix. 9 ff., xxvi. 6 ff.; Luke v. 27 ff., vii. 36 ff., x. 38 ff., xi. 37 ff., xiv. 1 ff.; John ii. 1 ff., xii. 1 ff.), just as Socrates

uses every opportunity of scattering the seeds of his words in the hope that here and there at any rate they will find a fitting soil.

With regard to the external form of the ministry of Jesus (of his doctrine we do not yet speak), all our evangelical accounts agree pretty well together. But as to the stage upon which this ministry develops itself, there is an important difference between the three first Evangelists and the fourth. Both sides, indeed, represent the public action of Jesus, after he had received in Judea the baptism of John, as beginning in Galilee and coming to an end in Jerusalem; but between these two limits, Jesus, in the fourth Gospel, moves, for the most part, on quite different ground from that on which he appears in the others. According to the last, from the time of his return after the baptism by John until his last journey to Jerusalem, he never passes the borders of Northern Palestine, but travels about in the countries west and east of the sea of Galilee and of the upper Jordan, where Antipas and Philip, the sons of Herod, were governing as Roman vassal princes, without ever touching Samaria to the south, and Judea and Jerusalem further in the same direction, or generally the territory that was immediately subject to the dominion of the Romans. And again within these boundaries it is more immediately the country west of the Jordan and of the sea of Tiberias, consequently Galilee, into which the ministry of Jesus principally falls. For we are only told of three short excursions to the eastern shore of the lake (Matt. viii. 18, ix. 1, xiv. 13—34, xv. 39), and two scarcely longer ones to the northern frontier of the region, the districts of Cæsarea Philippi (Matt. xvi. 13), and of the Phœnician towns of Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xv. 21—29). So, according to the three first Gospels, Jesus did not go up to Judea and Jerusalem at all previously to the journey to the feast which was to bring about his violent death. But according to the fourth he had been already at four feasts before this last

journey, a passover (ii. 13), a feast not particularly named (v. 1), then at a feast of tabernacles (vii. 2—10), and a feast of the dedication of the Temple (x. 22, and on this occasion, it appears, without leaving the town and the surrounding district in the interval between the two feasts) at Jerusalem; besides this, once in Bethany, in the neighbourhood of the capital. He had, moreover, delayed a considerable time in the country of Judea (iii. 22 ff.) and on the passage through Samaria, some time also in a small town in the neighbourhood of the wilderness of Judea.

In connection with this point, whenever Jesus leaves Galilee after having gone there subsequently to the imprisonment of the Baptist, the three Evangelists, and especially Matthew, give a particular reason for his doing so. This reason may be that he wished to escape the pressure of the people by crossing the lake (Matt. viii. 18), or withdrew from the plots of Herod into the wilderness on the other side (xiv. 13), or that, on account of the offence which the scribes took at his doctrine, he escaped into the region of Tyre and Sidon (xv. 21). But John, exactly contrariwise, usually gives a particular reason for Jesus' leaving Judea and retiring towards Galilee and Peræa. Sometimes the reason given is the dangerous notice taken of him by his enemies (iv. 1 ff.), sometimes their plots and schemes for murdering him (vii. 1, vi. 1, comp. with v. 18; x. 39 ff., comp. with xi. 54). The two sides, therefore start from opposite grounds: the three first Evangelists suppose the province assigned to Jesus for his ministry until his fatal journey, was Galilee, which he left sometimes only on particular occasions and for a short time; the fourth imagines, conversely, that Jesus would properly have always laboured in Jerusalem and Judea if prudence had not sometimes recommended to him to withdraw into the more remote provinces.

Of these opposite assumptions only one can be the true one. The majority, therefore, of the theologians of the pre-

sent day naturally pronounce against the Synoptics and for their favourite John. In the Galilean tradition, they say, from which the first, especially Matthew, derived their accounts, there was in the first place but little known of the earlier journeys of Jesus to the feasts; secondly, what was known of them was amalgamated at an early period with the accounts of the last and most important journey. And thus on the one hand the Galilean element, on the other the Judean, now appear in the three Evangelists as two connected masses. But John, they say, teaches us that this does not correspond to the fact, and that not only the Galilean labours of Jesus were interrupted by journeys to Jerusalem, but that his speeches and acts in Jerusalem were distributed over different sojourns there. Hence the journeys spoken of in John must furnish vacancies, into which the matter reported by the other Evangelists is so introduced, that on every occasion between any two of these journeys and the events in Judea connected with them, a portion of the events in Galilee shall fall. But what are we to hold by with this arrangement, when in the course of their Galilean narratives the three first Evangelists never allude to a journey in the direction of Judea, while the fourth, in what he tells us connected with Galilee, scarcely ever coincides with them? Everything is arbitrary, and the innumerable attempts to bring the Gospels into harmony in this respect can only be considered as so many tissues of groundless assumptions.

We must take courage to put the question thus: Which is historically the more probable, that Jesus (as the three first Gospels represent) laboured for some time exclusively in Galilee and the adjacent countries, and did not until the last decide upon the eventful journey to Jerusalem, and that then this produced the decisive result rapidly and all at once; or that, according to the account in John, he divided his ministry from the first between Galilee and Judea, repeatedly caused offence even at an earlier period, especially in Jeru-

salem, until at length on the occasion of his final presence there the matter came to an issue?

In attempting to answer this question, we may consider for a moment that of the duration of the public ministry of Jesus, so far as anything about it is to be gathered from our evangelical accounts. In no one of our Gospels is an express statement to be found of the length of time during which Jesus laboured in public. The three first Gospels supply nothing to enable us to form a conclusion in this direction, as months and years are nowhere distinguished in their writings, and the definitions of time occurring every now and then, "after two days," or "six days" (Matt. xvii. 1, xxvi. 2), can give no certainty in the midst of this general indefiniteness. But it would appear that those identical journeys to festivals, by the mention of which the fourth Gospel is distinguished from the others, might possibly assist us to a conclusion on this point. For from each of these annual festivals, especially from one Passover to the next (assuming the enumeration to be correct)—on each of these occasions we should have to count one year. Between the baptism of Jesus by John, which has always been considered the beginning of his public life (Acts i. 22), and the first Passover visited by him, the Evangelist seems to assume only a very short interval (comp. i. 29, xxxv. 44, ii. 1, 12); the second feast which he represents Jesus as visiting, as he describes it only in indefinite terms as a feast of the Jews (v. 1), can scarcely be taken to have been a Passover, and therefore gives us no ground to stand on; on the other hand, about the time of the miraculous feeding, a second Passover is mentioned, but nothing said of Jesus having visited it. Then before the fatal Passover (xi. 55, xii. 1, xiii. 1), no other is mentioned. Hence there results for the public ministry of Jesus at least two years, together with a short time from his baptism to his first Passover. We say, "at least," for the view of the ancient Church, which in the Jewish feast (v. 1) likewise saw

a Passover, brought out three years, and we on our part have no proof of the Evangelist having necessarily counted all the Passovers, or those which Jesus did not visit. It has been said that in opposition to the reckoning of John, it looks, according to the representation of the first three Evangelists, as if the ministration of Jesus had lasted at the most but one year. But this is not correct. For if Jesus did not visit earlier Passovers, those Evangelists whose eyes do not turn in the direction of Jerusalem until the time of Jesus' journey there, had no occasion to mention them. But that Jesus did not necessarily visit every Passover, is shewn by John himself when he represents him as staying quietly in Galilee during a Passover (vi. 4; comp. i. 17, 59, vii. 1 ff.). We must, therefore, say rather that from the three first Evangelists we learn absolutely nothing about the duration of Jesus' public ministry, and as far as they are concerned the Christians might just as well assume that he was labouring for a series of years as only one, but that in the former case he did not travel to the Passover at Jerusalem until the last year.

The supposition indeed of a ministry of one year's duration only, found as it is in the writings of several of the ancient Fathers of the Church and heretics,* rested solely on the passage in the prophet about the acceptable year of the Lord (Isaiah lxi. 2), which according to Luke (iv. 18) Jesus applied to himself, and which now by a double misunderstanding was taken in a strictly literal sense as defining the time of his labours. So likewise the opposite view rests upon a misunderstanding, that view which is also found among the Fathers of the Church, that Jesus was indeed baptized by John at thirty years of age, but was not at the time of his crucifixion far from fifty.† The misunderstanding was, that in John (viii. 57) the Jews on one occasion objected to him, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and wilt thou pretend

* Orig. de Princip. iv. 5. Clem. Hom. xvii. 19.

† Iren. Adv. Hær. ii. 22, 5.

to have seen Abraham?" But this might only mean that he had not yet reached the full age of manhood. If we would get a maximum for the duration of Jesus' public ministry, we must start from what is testified to us by heathen writers also,* that Jesus was crucified under Pontius Pilate. This officer, who had entered upon his duties in Judea in the year 25 of our era, was sent to Rome in the year 36 by Lucius Vitellius in order to defend himself against various accusations of the Jews. From Rome he never returned to Judea, consequently the crucifixion of Jesus cannot fall later. Now if we take the dates in Luke (iii. 1), which properly belong to the appearance of the Baptist, as marking at the same time the date of baptism and the public appearance of Jesus, so that this followed in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, which corresponds to the 29th of the Christian era, then the seven years from that time until the departure of Pontius Pilate give the longest time admissible for the ministry of Jesus. But the correctness of the dates as given in Luke being so doubtful, it is self-evident how uncertain this result must be.

It was of importance to settle this point before deciding between the Synoptic account and that of John in reference to the number of journeys to Feasts made by Jesus. If it is necessary, on the supposition that Jesus during his public ministry visited only one Passover, to assume also that that ministry only lasted a year, then the improbability of this last assumption might also incline us to take an unfavourable view of the three first Gospels on the question of the journeys, and to prefer the account of the fourth. And Renan in particular has been induced to defend the historical narrative of that Gospel by this consideration. If, on the other hand, supposing that on this question we adhere to the three first Gospels, it is still open to us to assume a longer duration of the public ministry of Jesus, then the question as to the

* Tacit. Annal. xv. 44.

number of journeys may be considered by itself, and the only thing to be decided is, whether in reference to them the Synoptic account or that of John has the most probability in its favour.

Now, in favour of the latter it is usual to maintain that a pious Galilean was bound to visit, at least, all the Passovers. But this, in the first place, cannot be proved as regards that period, and John himself, as has been said, does not imply it. In the next place, as has been said, it amounts to nothing if Jesus was not this Galilean, pious according to the law. The theology that defends John does indeed maintain that the three first Evangelists testify in his favour, and may be considered to state circumstances and mention expressions of Jesus which necessarily suppose an earlier sojourn* on his part in Judea and Jerusalem. But this assertion, when more accurately considered, is not true. The acquaintance with the member of council, Joseph of Arimathea, which is held to be inexplicable without such earlier sojourn, may very easily have been made in Jerusalem when Jesus was there for the last time, even if Joseph's home is not to be looked for in the Galilean locality of that name. Of Mary and Martha we only know from Luke (x. 38), that the village where they lived lay on the road to Judea from the ordinary dwelling-place of Jesus in Galilee,—possibly, therefore, in Galilee or in Perea; only John says that it was Bethany, near Jerusalem; and it is his credibility that is now in question. The only instance of importance in opposition to the representation of the Synoptics is the expression of Jesus (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34), "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not."

Jesus cannot, certainly, as Luke represents, have uttered

* Bleek, *Contributions to the Criticism of the Gospels*, p. 97 ff.

this expression on the road to Jerusalem, before having seen it even once during his public ministry; and even in Jerusalem itself he could not, after a single sojourn there of only a few days, have referred to the *number of times* he had sought in vain to draw the inhabitants of the city to him. All attempts at evasion are here to no purpose, and it must be admitted that, if these are the real words of Jesus, he must have worked in Jerusalem oftener and longer than appears from the synoptic Gospels. But they are not his words. Matthew, indeed, gives them as such, together with the other saying: Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes; and some of them ye shall kill and crucify, &c., that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, &c. (xxiii. 34 ff.); and the fact that in both expressions the abuse of divine missionaries by the Jews is spoken of, makes it probable that they were really originally connected. Luke, as he generally does, separates the two; but when he represents the last-mentioned expression of Jesus as being introduced with the words, "Therefore, also, said the wisdom of God: I will send you," &c. (xi. 49),—in the first place, this addition, just on account of its singularity which might cause Matthew to leave it out, is to be undoubtedly considered as original; and in the next place, looking to the connection between the two expressions, we have every reason to assume that that appeal to Jerusalem, connected with the former speech as it stands in him, likewise belongs to the speech about the wisdom of God. By this wisdom of God, Jesus can neither have meant himself nor the Evangelist Jesus, as neither such a designation nor such a quotation from himself appears anywhere else in the Gospels. The wisdom of God might be supposed to be the inspiration of the sacred writings of the Old Testament, but in the Old Testament no such expression is found. Some particular writing therefore appears rather to be meant by

it, the words of which one Evangelist makes Jesus quote, at the same time naming the source from which they came; the other puts them immediately into his mouth as his own expression. This writing might be one which, composed by a Christian about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, upbraided the Jews with the catalogue of their transgressions towards divine missionaries from the earliest times until the latest, consequently from Abel to Zachariah, Baruch's son, whom the zealots* murdered in the Temple. Stephen speaks in something of the same spirit in the Acts, chap. vii. But here the "wisdom of God" is personified as the agent, and the words, "I send you scribes," &c., are better suited for this personification than they are to the lips of Jesus.†

The assertion, therefore, that passages are found in the three first Gospels which are only intelligible on the supposition of the more frequent presence of Jesus in Jerusalem, is not correct. Conversely, the accusation may be brought against the author of the fourth Gospel, that with his representation it is difficult to understand how the first sojourn of Jesus in the capital was not also the last. According to the account of the Synoptics, after Jesus had healed the withered hand on the Sabbath-day, the Pharisees might immediately take counsel how they might kill him (Matt. xii. 14), and after the sharp attacks which, on occasion of the dispute as to the washing of hands, he had taken the liberty of making upon them, they might have lain in wait for him in order to get ground for an accusation against him (xi. 53 ff.); all this might be the case as early as we will, and we may still understand why the execution of these plots was not so easy. The reason of course would be, that in Galilee the hierarchical party was not strong enough to carry off a popular personage like Jesus from the midst of his adherents; but as soon as

* Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* 4, 5, 4.

† Comp. my essay: *Jesus' Invocation of Woe upon Jerusalem, &c.*, in *Hilgenfeld's Journal of Scientific Theology*, 1863, p. 84 ff.

they had him in the centre of their power, in Jerusalem, they advanced to their object without hesitation and without obstacle. In John, the case is quite different. There, from the very first, Jesus ventures repeatedly into the lions' den, and conducts himself in it in such a manner that we cannot help wondering more and more how he several times comes out of it again. On his very first visit to Jerusalem he drives the buyers and sellers out of the Temple. And he does this, on the one hand, in a still more violent and offensive manner than in the Synoptics (John alone knows anything of the whip that he made use of); on the other hand, with less support from an enthusiastic mob of followers, for Jesus, on the occasion of this his first visit, had not, as in that of the last, been introduced with a solemn procession and reception. Even here we must feel surprise that the matter went off so smoothly, especially as the idea of the destruction and rebuilding of the Temple, which Jesus connected with it, was but little adapted to pacify men's minds. On his second visit to the capital, on occasion of the unnamed festival, a cure performed by him on the Sabbath makes the Jews wish to put him to death, and speeches in which he appeared to compare himself to God strengthen them in their resolution (v. 16, 18; comp. vii. 1, 19). At the following feast of the Tabernacles again, they repeatedly wished to seize him, and even sent out servants to arrest him (vii. 30, 32, 44). If we ask, Why did they not do it when they might have done it at any time in the capital? why did not their officers arrest him, as they were ordered to do?—the Evangelist can give no reason except that his hour was not yet come (vii. 30, viii. 20). So on another occasion when they had taken up stones against Jesus, he says that Jesus hid himself from them, and escaped unmolested into the Temple (viii. 59; comp. x. 39, xii. 36). That is, the Evangelist appeals to a miracle, and in fact something of the sort would have been necessary to postpone the decision any longer, when on the

one side the quarrel had gone so far, and on the other the opportunity was so favourable. We may remark too, in passing, the obvious contradiction that Jesus is said to have avoided Judea, or at all events the capital, in the interval between the Feasts, in order to escape from the plots of his enemies in that place (iv. 1, vii. 1, xi. 54); when, if his hour was not yet come, and if he had the power of withdrawing out of their sight in a miraculous manner, he might have easily continued to stay there.

The fourth Evangelist having brought matters to a crisis too soon by his narratives of the earlier sojourns of Jesus for the Feasts, has constantly to retard them;* and having thus crippled the natural course of events, he finds himself compelled, in order to come to the catastrophe, to introduce a false motive in the raising of Lazarus. This anticipation is generally the way with this Evangelist. With him, nothing can be done in a natural manner, but everything already existed beforehand. In the others, a longer time and many developments are required, until at last the most competent of the Apostles recognises in Jesus the Messiah. But in the fourth Gospel, his brother Andrew (which, indeed, in the Johannine point of view, is not correct) is clear about this at the first moment (i. 42). So with regard to Simon, Jesus does what comes much later in the other Gospels; he designates at first sight Peter as the man who is a rock (i. 43), proclaims his own death on the cross and his resurrection on the occasion of his very first visit to a feast (ii. 19 ff., iii. 14), and knows the traitor from the very beginning (vi. 71).

By this the fourth Evangelist displays throughout an effort to make everything that tends to exalt Jesus happen as soon as possible. And thus it is intelligible why he could not wait to bring Jesus out of a corner of Galilee to the more appropriate theatre which the capital offered to him, in order to make the light of his spirit shine forth, to display his higher dignity,

* Comp. Baur, *Critical Examination*, pp. 190, 283 ff.

and to prove his courage as well as divine power—two points which naturally exclude each other. But the chief point is, that with the plan of the fourth Gospel to oppose Jewish unbelief, as the principle of darkness, to that of light and life as manifested in Jesus, it was necessary to exhibit this antagonism from the first, especially in the city which was the metropolis of Jewish exclusiveness.

But let us for a moment disregard the suspicion which is aroused against the Johannine account of several visits to festivals on the part of Jesus, partly by the unhistorical pragmatism which he connects with them, partly by his evident inclination to ante-date facts, and let us simply assume that he only made the disputes occur too soon, and that Jesus had indeed been several times in Jerusalem already before his last journey, but had proceeded there so carefully and cautiously that his life was not yet seriously threatened. Still the representation of facts given by John will not be recognised as the most probable. Judea and its capital were the seat and the stronghold of everything that Jesus wished to combat; there the Pharisaic party ruled over a population readily excitable to fanaticism; there the spirit of formalism in religion, the attachment to sacrifices and purifications, had its firmest hold in the numerous priesthood, the splendid Temple and its solemn services. On this spot Jesus could not reasonably venture to come forward in opposition to this tendency until, by labouring in regions where that tendency was less prominent, where men's minds were more open to his teaching, he had gained for himself adherents and power, doing this by acquiring, on the one hand, a more accurate knowledge of the people, according to their different classes and their different degrees of susceptibility for deep religious feeling; and, on the other hand, forming his own plan more definitely by a regard to circumstances. During, indeed, this lengthened ministry in Galilee, Jesus had a response in extensive circles, and he had also a narrower circle of confidential disciples. But if he wished to operate on a large scale,

if he wished not merely to increase the number of already existing Jewish sects by the addition of a new one, but to give a different form to the whole religious system of his people, then it was indispensable for him to have a proper preparation in the province, and at last to make the decisive attempt in the capital itself. That this would not end favourably, Jesus might foresee. He might foresee it from the experiences of all kinds which he had had of the obstinacy of the hierarchical party, the immorality and stupidity of the masses, and the unsteadiness of the momentary enthusiasm of even sympathetic circles; but the thing itself drove him onwards; not going forward was the same thing as abandoning all the success he had hitherto attained. On the other hand, if he did not shrink before the final step, he might even with an unfavourable issue reckon upon the effect which martyrdom for a great idea has never failed to produce.

41. MODE OF TEACHING OF JESUS.

In the energy which Jesus developed on the theatre of which we have spoken, his work as a Teacher naturally takes precedence of everything else; and as we have already attempted to describe the principles of his religious point of view, consequently the main substance of his doctrine, we would now endeavour to look at this more on the side of its form, and therefore at once examine the mode of teaching adopted by Jesus. And while we do so, much also will come out having reference to the substance which may be supplementary to what has been explained before.

We are not merely told by the Evangelists (Matt. vii. 28; Mark i. 22; Luke iv. 32; John vi. 68) that Jesus as a Teacher produced a rapturous effect, and made upon susceptible minds a deep impression, but it is proved by the historical sequel. If we ask for the cause of this effect, Justin Martyr in his first Apology says of Jesus: * "His speeches were short and

* Justin Mart. Apol. i. 14.

convincing, for he was not a Sophist, but his word was the power of God." By these expressions are described not only the depth of his religious feeling, out of which his speech welled forth, but also the natural simplicity of its form. He was not a Sophist, says the Doctor of the Church with his Greek education, *i. e.* translated into Jewish language, he was not a Rabbi, he spoke not like the Scribes (Matt. vii. 29); subtle argumentative proofs were not his forte, but the telling word which carries its proofs within itself.

Hence in the Gospels that rich collection of sentences or gnomes, of those pregnant texts which, even independent of their religious worth, are so invaluable for the clear penetration, the unerring common sense, expressed in them. Give to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, and to God that which is God's; no one puts a new patch on an old garment, or keeps new wine in old bottles; those that are well need not a physician, but only the sick; if thine hand or thy foot offend thee, cut it off and cast it from thee; take first the beam out of thine own eye, and then thou shalt see clearly how to take the mote out of thy brother's eye; not seven times shalt thou forgive thy brother who offends thee, but seventy times seven;—these are imperishable words, for in them truths that are every day getting fresh corroboration are enclosed in a form that exactly suits them, and is at the same time universally intelligible.

These wise texts were mostly drawn from Jesus on occasions of the moment, as that about tribute-money by an ensnaring question of the Pharisees; that about placability by a question of Peter; that about the physician by the offence which the Pharisees took at his intercourse with the publicans. On the other hand, the texts about the mote and the beam and the cutting off of the hand are found in our Gospels in the connection of a long speech (Matt. v. 30, vii. 3 ff.), several of which are preserved in the Gospels as having been made by Jesus with the object of instructing a wider or a narrower circle. Thus the Sermon on the Mount serves the

purpose of enlightening the wider circle of the adherents of Jesus with regard to the fundamental principles of his religious ministry; the code of instructions to the Twelve is intended to instal them in their office as evangelical missionaries; the polemics of Jesus against the Pharisaic tendency are comprised in the great speech delivered against that sect. Longer speeches of this kind are found especially in the Gospel of Matthew, and it may be assumed as an acknowledged fact that the Evangelist only strung together externally on one thread pearls of texts which belonged originally to different occasions (as, *e.g.* in the Sermon on the Mount, from vi. 19), and also that after the departure of Jesus texts after his method were composed, having reference to later circumstances and mixed with his. In so far as texts of this kind can be considered genuine, they present a natural though by no means carefully regulated line of thought; but the form of expression, as in those short texts, is always simple, pregnant, and clear; the examples from common life, the images from Nature, are always happily chosen, and often presented in a really poetical manner.

The poetic element prevails still more in the parables, a form in which Jesus was fond of clothing his doctrines, partly in order to attract the people by the imagery, partly to give to the more intelligent, to whom he explained them, opportunity for exercising their power of understanding and their reflection.* The parable, or apologue, a form of exposition traditional in the East, and appearing also in the Old Testament on many occasions, appears at that time to have been an especial favourite. Besides what we find in the Gospels, we may see this not merely from the Talmud, but Josephus also represents the

* That Jesus, conversely, chose this form in order to conceal the mystery of the kingdom of heaven, and so to bring about the fulfilment (Matt. xiii. 10—15) of the prophecy in Isaiah vi. 9 ff., is only the view, to a certain extent morbid, taken by the Evangelist, who had learned by experience that the Jewish people on the whole were incapable of appreciating the doctrine of Jesus. Comp. Hilgenfeld, *Gospels*, p. 82 ff.

Emperor Tiberius as defending himself by a parable against the censure he incurred by his habit of changing his officials in the provinces as seldom as possible.*

The seven parables which Matthew strings together in his 13th chapter, and which are only partially found in the two other Synoptics, were certainly not delivered in this manner one after the other, but quite as certainly, next to the Sermon on the Mount, form part of the most genuine matter which remains to us of the utterances of Jesus. The first, that of the Sower, which appears in all the synoptic Gospels, has something particularly original about it. For, on the one hand, it comes from the living experience of Jesus as a Teacher, on the other it brings into view an original moral phenomenon, in the different susceptibilities of men for spiritual impressions. It may be doubted whether the second, about the tares in the field, and the seventh, about the net, which only Matthew has, come from Jesus himself; they rest upon the experienced fact that impure elements cannot all at once be removed from human or even from Christian society; a theory which refers to a later period in the Church already in existence, even though we may choose to consider as merely accidental the coincidence of the expression "an enemy" for the sower of tares, with the Ebionitic designation of the Apostle Paul. The third and fourth parables, of the Grain of Mustard-seed and the Leaven, illustrate the growth of the new religious principle. The first contrasts its unostentatious beginnings with its mighty results, the other illustrates the power it possesses to penetrate all portions and relations of humanity. The two parables, finally, of the Treasure in the Field and of the Pearl, representing as they do the incomparable value of the newly-opened kingdom of heaven, are only symbolical illustrations of the text (Matt. vi. 33) which directs men to seek before everything the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, and to be indifferent about

* Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii. 6, 5.

all beside.* So also the isolated parable of the king who reckons with his servants (Matt. xviii. 23—35) may be considered an illustration of the fifth clause in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi. 12).

In the group of parables which Matthew combines together in the thirteenth chapter, the kingdom of God is looked at on the side of its development. It is shewn how among mankind it is planted unobserved, variously received, opposed, polluted by the access of impure ingredients; how, nevertheless, it incessantly goes on developing and perfecting itself; and how participation in it is the most precious reward of human exertion. Again, in a number of other parables which Matthew and partly also Luke transfer to the time of the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem and of his sojourn there, the Church is viewed more on the side of its perfection and final consummation. From this point notice is taken of the difference of the lot which will be assigned to men according as they stand in their relation to it. Here are discussed the differences between the different ranks of the Jewish people; between the Pharisees and the Scribes, hardened in hypocritical self-righteousness, and the mass of the people, deeply sunk indeed in sin, but conscious of being so and therefore capable of improvement. Of these last, the publicans are especially brought forward, hated as they were and despised on account of their worship of the Romans and of Mammon. The speaker, however, does not confine himself within the limits of the Jewish people, but they are threatened with an invitation to the heathen into the kingdom of God. And then the subject is sometimes handled in such a manner that when only one side of the contrast appears to be given, the other also may be seen, though in a manner due, it may be, only to

* At the same time they remind us of Prov. iii. 13 ff., "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom and the man that getteth understanding, for the merchandise of it is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold. She is more precious than rubies; and all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared unto her."

the report of the Evangelist. Thus the subject of the parable of the Servants and the Talents in Matthew (xxv. 14—30) is simply the application or non-application of the gifts imparted to men by God; but in the later form of it in Luke (xix. 12—27), where instead of talents minæ are spoken of, in the citizens who would not recognise the Lord as King, and are therefore slain at last, a reference to the Jews and the national misfortunes that impend over them for their rejection of Jesus has been added. In like manner, the parable of the Two Sons in Matthew (xxi. 28—31), the one of whom promises to obey his father's commands but does not, while the other acts in the converse manner, is pointed by Jesus himself at the High-priest and elders on the one side, at the publicans and harlots on the other; while in the parable of the Prodigal Son, obviously connected with this (Luke xv. 11—32), the allusion to the relation between Jews and Heathens can scarcely be mistaken. In the parable, peculiar to Matthew, of the Labourers in the Vineyard, who, whether hired soon or late, are all rewarded alike (xx. 1—16), the allusion to Jewish and Gentile Christians, and the rejection of the claims to precedence on the part of the first, are clearly expressed; while the two parables of the Supper of the King (Matt. xxii. 1—14; Luke xiv. 16—24) and of the rebellious Labourers in the Vineyard (Matt. xxi. 33—41; Mark xii. 1—9; Luke xx. 9—16), extend to the final exclusion and punishment of the stiff-necked Jewish people. And here it is remarkable that whereas the parable of the Talents in Matthew appears in its original form, in Luke on the other hand touched up in an anti-Jewish spirit, in the parable of the Supper the case as between the two Evangelists is reversed. In Luke, the host is simply a man who prepares a great supper, the persons invited (*i.e.* the Jews, especially the proud hierarchs) simply refuse to accept the invitation, for which they are merely excluded from the supper, and in their place not only the poor and the maim of the city (*i.e.* perhaps publicans and the like),

but also the people from the highways and hedges (the heathen), are invited and regularly forced to come. In Matthew, the host is not only said to be a King, with obvious reference to the Messiah, who makes a marriage-feast for his son, but also out of the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard, related by the Evangelist immediately before, the foreign feature is imported into this, representing that those invited, beside refusing the invitation, abuse and slay the servants who invite them, for which the King commands his armies to destroy them and burn their city. And it is evident that this feature was introduced into the parable after the event, namely, the destruction of Jerusalem. The addition, in Matthew, of the marriage garment is inappropriate, as such a thing could not properly be expected of the poor and the maim; but whether the allusion is supposed to be to circumcision or baptism, both of which ceremonies were imposed upon the Gentiles on entering the Church, it might tend to pacify the Jewish Christians.

These later parables of Matthew, of which Mark has only the one about the Labourers in the Vineyard, Luke that about the Supper and that about the Minæ, to which we may add that of the Watchful Servants (Matt. xxiv. 45 ff.; Luke xii. 42) and of the Ten Virgins (Matt. xxv. 1 ff.), shew, by the touches and additions to which some of them have been subjected, the work of a strange hand, and raise a doubt generally whether we have in them utterances of Jesus himself, and not rather of the consciousness of the earliest Church. The parable of the Ten Virgins is the real expression of the expectation of Christ's second advent at an early period, vivid as it was in Christendom during the century after his departure; that of the Rebellious Labourers, founded upon the famous allegory in Isaiah v., upbraids the Jews with exactly the same list of sins that is found in Matthew xxiii. 34—39, Luke xi. 49—51, xiii. 34 ff., and derived from a Christian writing of the date of the destruction of Jerusa-

lem; and in the parable of the King's Supper, the features introduced by Matthew betray a reference to the events that followed some time after.

A third group of parables is that of those peculiar to Luke, but which also divide themselves into two dissimilar groups. Other writers have already drawn attention to a feature as characteristic of a common source in the parables contained in the 16th and 18th chapters in Luke. That feature is the prevailing designation of the steward (xvi. 8), of mammon (xvi. 9), of the judge (xviii. 6) as unjust, or more accurately as steward, judge, &c., of unrighteousness.* Besides this there is, in the two latter parables, and in that of the rich landed proprietor (xii. 16—21), the peculiarity that the turning-point of the narrative is formed in each by a monologue held by the hero of it, and introduced by the narrator in a similar way. "And he thought within himself," it is said of the man who knew not what to do with his fruits, "saying;" of the unjust steward, "he said within himself;" and likewise of the unjust judge, "but afterwards he said within himself." Nay, even in the first words of these monologues, and indeed in a very peculiar form of speech, the parables of the rich landed proprietor and the unjust steward coincide.† The first begins, "What shall I do?" . . . "this will I do;" just in the same way the other, "What shall I do?" . . . "I am resolved what to do;" as, on the other hand, between the monologue of the unjust judge and the description of the character of the lazy friend,‡ the parable about whom also belongs to this group (xi. 5 ff.), a turn of language common to both is not to be mistaken.

* τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας, according to the Heb. idiom for τὸν ἄδικον οἰκονόμον, as below, xviii. 6, ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας, i. e. ὁ ἄδικος, the unjust judge.

† Comp. Köstlin, The Synoptic Gospels, p. 274.

‡ Luke xi. 8 (of the lazy friend): εἰ καὶ οὐ δώσει αὐτῷ . . . διὰ γε . . . δώσει αὐτῷ, Luke xviii. 4 ff. (the unjust judge): εἰ καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐ φοβοῦμαι . . . διὰ γε . . . ἐκδικήσω αὐτήν.

These marks of a common source are at the same time so many marks of a Jewish-Christian, or, more accurately speaking, of an Ebionitish source. In the parable of the unjust steward, worldly wealth is represented as in itself an unrighteous thing; in that of the lazy friend and unjust judge, especial stress is laid on prayer, as we find to have been particularly the case among the Ebionites. It is true, indeed, that Jesus estimated highly both poverty and prayer; but the reason of our demurring to attribute these parables to him himself, is partly their one-sided spirit, partly the indirectness which we nowhere observe in the parables of Jesus in Matthew, chap. xiii. By indirectness we mean, that in the application a main feature of the story must be entirely disregarded. The lazy friend, the unjust judge, who is only to be softened by the importunity of persevering prayer, is God: the unjust steward is praised for his unfaithfulness, meaning indeed his discreet use of unlawfully acquired wealth, which, unrighteous in itself, is the real subject of commendation, and the unfaithfulness is simply secondary in the moral of the story.

Harshnesses of this kind, as we observed, are not found in those parables which are referred to Jesus with the greatest probability in their favour. Quite as little are forms of speech found in them so exactly imitative of the Jewish as, "What shall I do?" . . . "this will I do." There can be no doubt that the author of the third Gospel, bent as he was on reconciling opposite principles, took this half of the parables peculiar to him from an Ebionitish source, in order that he might in his own way gain a hearing for the extreme right of the tendencies at that time prevailing in the Church.

The parables of Jesus on the other side, in Luke, are far more in the peculiar manner of Jesus, both in substance and form. Such are those of the Pharisee and Publican (xviii. 9—14), of the Good Samaritan (xi. 30—37), and the Prodigal Son (xv. 11—32). It may be, indeed, that in the two last there

is a touch of Paulinism, as in the one the Samaritan, set up as an example, may be considered as resembling a heathen, and in the other the self-righteous elder son may likewise be a type of the later Jewish Christianity, and the repentant younger one of the heathen world turning to Christianity. And possibly this feeling may have been in the mind of the Evangelist, and have influenced his mode of reporting the parables, but still the parables themselves may have been delivered by Jesus, much as they appear here, corresponding to his spirit so accurately as they do. Between these two classes of parables peculiar to Luke, stands (as has already been said above) that of the rich man and the pauper Lazarus (xvi. 19—31). This parable is intermediate between the two, inasmuch as in it an anti-Jewish moral appears to be built upon an Ebionitish foundation. It is as probable that the foundation is due to a Jewish-Christian source, as it is that the conclusion is attributable to the form in which the Evangelist has reported the parable.

The instructive speeches of Jesus frequently appear as occasioned by questions. At one time his disciples ask him who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xviii. 1); or Peter, how often he is to forgive his brother who offends him (xviii. 21). At another time the disciples of the Baptist ask why his disciples are not to fast so often as they themselves and the Pharisees (ix. 14); or the Scribes and Pharisees, how his disciples came to omit the prescribed ablutions before eating (xv. 2). In the same way the three first Evangelists string together towards the end of the career of Jesus a series of interrogations which his enemies directed against him. They do this either with the view of disparaging him with the people if he cannot answer them, or drawing from him an answer which may somehow or other be used to his disadvantage. On his very first removal from Galilee, the Pharisees, in Matthew, put the question to him about divorce (xix. 3); then as he comes into the Temple on the day after

his entrance into Jerusalem, he is met by the High-priests and elders of the people with the question about his authority, and they are silenced by him with the counter-question as to the authority of John the Baptist. With this proceeding are connected, on the part of Jesus, several parables; and then there follows, on the same scene, a group of three questions put by his enemies, and a counter-question from him which gets him rest (Matt. xxii. 15—46; Mark xii. 13—37; Luke xx. 20—44). The answers of Jesus to these questions consist in part of those short and memorable texts which we have already considered above as the fundamental elements of his speeches. Our reason for mentioning them here particularly is, that in these answers Jesus shews himself in the character of an expositor of Scripture. The Sadducees, putting before him a case possible under the Jewish marriage-law, endeavour to throw ridicule on the Pharisaic doctrine of the resurrection, which had been also taken up by Jesus. In answer, he first of all removes the casuistical difficulty by a more spiritual view of the doctrine, and then endeavours to prove the doctrine of the resurrection, and that of the immortality involved in it, by appealing to a form of expression usual in the books of Moses. God there calls himself "the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob;" it is, says he, impossible for him to call himself the God of the dead; hence it follows that those men are alive (xxiii. 31 ff.). Now these stories about Jesus look so like several anecdotes about the Rabbis in the Talmud, that it has been suspected that they were invented in Jewish-Christian circles, in part at least as parallels to these anecdotes, in order to place Jesus on a par with those Jewish celebrities in point of argumentative capacity. But this refutation of the Pharisees is just what might be very readily dispensed with, for few persons will agree with De Wette in finding in it a successful proof by means of a profound understanding of the Scriptures. It is disposing of the Rabbis in Rabbinical fashion, and is in this

sense indeed an excellent *argumentatio ad hominem*, but without objective value in point of truth. A man who confers a benefit on the children and grandchildren of a deceased friend, and in doing so explains that he is doing so as a friend of their father and grandfather, does not, by saying so, express the smallest opinion as to the continuance or non-continuance in life of the latter at the time of his conferring the benefit; on the contrary, his words would be more appropriate supposing him not to believe in immortality. All that he does say anything about is his friendship towards the deceased persons, a friendship (he means to say) that has existed up to that time, and still continues to exist and to operate on his mind. This is exactly the case with that Mosaic designation of Jehovah. The author of 2 Mos. iii. 6, when he applied it, was thinking only of the earthly history of the Patriarchs, by no means of their condition at that time, which, according to his conception, was as a sojourning in Scheol, the kingdom of shadows, both life and not life. On the other hand, according to the Pharisaic conception of that time, the departed saints were reserved for the future resurrection in a better department of this subterranean world (comp. Luke xvi. 22 ff.); and when Jesus represents these three patriarchs in particular as having precedence at the supper of perfected saints in the kingdom of the Messiah, consequently after the resurrection (Matt. viii. 11), we see how firmly convinced he was of their continuance in life. The grounds of this conviction he read also in the Old Testament, which, in this sense, knows nothing of immortality. But that he should have done so is so natural, that this circumstance, in the eyes of those who, as we do, look upon him only as a human being, is no discredit to him. In those days, not one of all the Jews in Palestine or out of it knew anything of a grammatical historical interpretation of the Scriptures; they were just those of the greatest genius, like Philo, who were in this respect the shallowest; no one

asked, "What did the writer of these words mean by them? What, according to circumstances, must they mean, or, according to the conceptions of those times, can they mean?" but what the reader thought he recognised in them as true and divine—that only, if it was capable of being connected with his words, the sacred writer could, that only he must, have meant. Even without this anecdote, we are as much persuaded that Jesus shared in this erroneous mode of explanation of his contemporaries and countrymen, as that he knew nothing of the Copernican system of the universe. But it is precisely in this that we see his greatness, that he read the ancient scripture in a new spirit. Thus he was a prophet, though an indifferent interpreter.

Hitherto, in our illustrations of the mode of teaching adopted by Jesus, we have kept exclusively to the first three Evangelists. The reason for doing so is, that from the fourth no conclusion with regard to it is to be drawn. Even if we could admit that the author of it, while following the principles of his totally heterogeneous education, may here and there have approached the spirit and mind of Jesus, still in the particulars of form and expression the case is quite otherwise. Where these have the stamp of genuineness, he has taken them from our synoptic Gospels and others at that time in existence. Conversely, so far as they are peculiar to himself, they have all the marks of being fictitious and unhistorical. Several of the well-known Synoptic sentiments, such as that of destroying the Temple and building it up again (Matt. xxvi. 61; John ii. 19), of the Prophet not being respected in his own country (Matt. xiii. 57; John iv. 44), the miraculous expression, Arise, take up thy bed and walk! (Mark ii. 9; John v. 9), the texts that he who would save his life must lose it, and conversely (Matt. x. 39, xvi. 25; John xii. 25), that the servant is not above his master, nor the disciple greater than his teacher (Matt. x. 24; John xiii. 16), that he who receives his disciples receives himself, and

in him, him who sent him (Matt. x. 40 ; John xiii. 20), the command, Arise, and let us go hence ! (Matt. xxvi. 46 ; John xiv. 31)—these sentences are adopted also by the author of the fourth Gospel, though with partial alterations ; but even from the inappropriate places into which he puts several of them (*e.g.* iv. 44, xiii. 16, xiv. 31), we see that he knew not how to deal with such subject-matter ; that whereas he might have cut them out of the raw material, still, accustomed as he was to draw upon his own imagination for speeches of Jesus, he knew not how to introduce the genuine traditionary sayings into the lines of thought peculiar to himself. Thus he would have been glad to give parables ; but the tone of those of the Synoptics was far too much opposed to that of the speeches he attributes to Christ, and he himself composed none. His parables of the Good Shepherd (x. 1 ff.) and of the Vine (xv. 1 ff.) are only allegories, not parables, being deficient in the historical element which a fable requires. The Johannine Christ never gets sufficiently away from self to be able to give a history in the form of a parable ; the form of the parable is far too objective for the subjective tone of feeling in this Gospel. The form of controversial discussion, which likewise holds a distinguished place in the Synoptics, suited the author best ; but even this he has quite changed. The controversies which in the three first Gospels turn upon the questions of the period, Fasting, Ablution, Sabbath-keeping, Taxation, the doctrines of the Resurrection, of the Messiah, turn, in the fourth, in reference to the last, only upon the person and dignity of Jesus. In the Synoptics, even the question about the person of the Messiah is treated by Jesus quite objectively (Matt. xxii. 47 ff.). Conversely, in the fourth, we see even the question about the Sabbath, objective in itself, instantly brought into the closest connection with the peculiarly Johannine doctrine of the person of Jesus (v. 17 ff.). The Jesus of John speaks as it were in ciphers, the key to which is the Logos-christology of the

Evangelist, and which are therefore unintelligible and repulsive to the interlocutors who are without this key. If one statement is misunderstood, he then, in order to shew more strongly the indispensability of the key, propounds another which can still less be understood without the key; and thus the controversy is spun out in a manner which, even if edifying for the possessors of the key, the readers of the fourth Gospel, must have been in the highest degree unprofitable to the Jews, who did not possess and could not get it; and on the part of Jesus, as it could do nothing but estrange him from the people, a hindrance to the object he had in view. Not one of these speeches of Jesus, peculiar to John, could be rightly understood, so long as he stood as a human being before human beings; consequently not one of them was so uttered by him.

42. THE MIRACLES OF JESUS.

In our third Gospel, the disciples on the road to Emmaus describe the crucified Jesus as a Prophet mighty in deed and word (xxiv. 19). It is in fact his performing of miracles that is here understood, and this, as a proof of his prophetic dignity, is put before his words or his doctrine. So also in the Acts, in the Pentecostal speech of the Apostle Peter, he is called a man approved of God by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him (ii. 22). According to the testimony of the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. i. 22), it was a national peculiarity of the Jews to desire signs from a man in whose doctrine they wished to believe, *i.e.* consequences were expected to follow upon his word, for the production of which human power was not sufficient, in order to prove that God was with him (John iii. 2); as on one occasion Moses was supposed to have spoken to the people before the suppression of the rebellious rout of Corah (4 Mos. xvi. 28 ff.), "Hereby

ye shall know that the Lord hath sent me to do all these works; for I have not done them of mine own mind: if these men die the common death of all men—then the Lord hath not sent me: but if the Lord make a new thing, and the earth open her mouth—then ye shall understand that these men (in me) have provoked the Lord.”

As the national legend of the Hebrews had attributed to Moses, one of the most eminent prophets, a series of such miracles as might then be read in the books held sacred by them, it was natural that miracles should in like manner be expected of every one who claimed to be a prophet, or even “the last Saviour of the people” (after Moses, the first), *i.e.* the Messiah, and that a Teacher possessed of all other gifts should not be held in full estimation if he was without this proof of having received credentials from above (comp. John x. 41). Accordingly it is quite credible, as we read in the Gospels, that on more than one occasion when Jesus put forward pretensions which none but a Prophet could put forward, that he was met by the demand for an accrediting sign. In the three first Gospels, the High-priest and elders, when he appeared in the Temple as a reformer (the day before he had expelled the buyers and sellers out of it), questioned him as to the authority by which he did these things (Matt. xxi. 23; Mark xi. 28; Luke xx. 2). And the fourth Evangelist changed this application into the question, “What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things?” So also in Matthew (xii. 38), the Scribes and Pharisees on one occasion accost Jesus with the expression of a wish to see a sign from him, which on another occasion they define more accurately as a sign from heaven (Matt. xvi. 1; Mark viii. 11).

But it is also very natural that Jesus should have refused to comply with demands of this sort. It was said, indeed, that the old prophets had also done such things; but the old prophets lived in the popular legend, Jesus, at that time, in strict historical reality, and it was not until later that he was

to be seized upon by legend as those old prophets had been. According to Mark (viii. 12), Jesus returned a summary answer to the demand for a sign on the part of the Pharisees, that no sign whatever shall be given to that evil and adulterous generation. In Matthew (xii. 39, xvi. 4) and Luke (xi. 29) he adds, no sign except the sign of the Prophet Jonas. This is explained, indeed, in Matthew by the well-known reference (ver. 40) to Jesus' three days' stay in the grave, as prefigured by the Prophet's three days' stay in the belly of the whale. But this addition is wanting in Luke, where it is only said that as Jonas was a sign for the Ninevites, so shall the Son of Man be a sign for this generation. And how far he was to be so we learn when it is further said in Luke that the people of Nineveh shall rise in judgment against this generation, for they repented at the preaching of Jonas; not so, we must understand, the contemporaries of Jesus at his. That this is the original meaning of the speech about the sign of Jonas, is proved by Matthew, even in opposition to his own explanation. After the words about the remaining in the belly of the whale, he continues, as Luke does also, that the Ninevites shall bear witness in the judgment against this generation, for they repented at the preaching of Jonas (not therefore at the miracle of his preservation out of the whale's belly). The fact also that in the two Evangelists, together with the Ninevites who repented at the preaching of Jonas, the Queen of Sheba is mentioned, who was attracted from the ends of the earth by the wisdom of Solomon, shews that here it is not a miracle that is in question, but anything that makes a great impression. The preaching of Jonas even for a single day made such an impression upon the inhabitants of Nineveh, that they repented, king and all: God offers to the Jews a better and still stronger opportunity for amendment and salvation in Jesus and his preaching, but they will not use it. It was a natural result that after the death of Jesus, and when the belief in his resurrection had arisen,

the latter was understood by the sign of Jonas, and this view introduced as the express explanation of Jesus. We have already seen that Luke, as compared with Matthew, has preserved the more original form of the speech of Jesus.*

According to the strict sense of the words, by the expression about the sign of Jonas, even if it is to be referred to the resurrection, all other miracles, especially those immediately in question, the miracles, namely, to be performed by Jesus, are refused by him. But, it is said, they are not to be taken in a strict and general sense, as is clear from the limitation added, that it is "to this evil and adulterous generation," *i.e.* not to the contemporaries of Jesus generally, but only to the Pharisees and Scribes, who had demanded a sign, that none shall be given. But if Jesus did perform miracles generally, and many of them as publicly as the narrative of the Evangelists tells us, they were performed for the Scribes and Pharisees as well as others. They therefore might see them as others did, and according to the Gospels actually saw them on more than one occasion. By the "generation" censured by him, Jesus meant here, as in Matt. xi. 16, his contemporaries generally, whose want of susceptibility and perversity in the case of the Pharisees and Scribes came under his observation in a particularly glaring manner. No doubt from this perverse majority a superior minority may be distinguished, but not in the sense of miracles being performed for them, which indeed could not have been done thus exclusively. On the contrary, we must suppose that the character

* Baur (Critical Examination of the Canonical Gospels, p. 513 ff.) finds in the expression about the sign of Jonas, in its original form, a reference to the Resurrection of Jesus, and considers therefore not merely this explanation in Matthew, but also the words in Luke, "except the sign of the Prophet Jonas," as an expansion of the actual words of Jesus, after the fact (of the Resurrection) had happened. In point of fact it comes to the same thing whether it is so or not; only, if the mention of Jonah is omitted, there is no suitable transition to what Jesus says immediately after about the repentance of the Ninevites at the preaching of Jonah.

of this minority would be such, that they would neither demand nor require miracles.

It is true, indeed, that the answer which Jesus gave to the messengers of the Baptist, appealing as he did to a series of miracles which he was performing (Matt. xi. 5; Luke vii. 22), and to the performance of them as a sign of his Messianic commission, appears to stand in the sheerest contradiction to this refusal to perform signs and wonders. To this detailed account of the miracles which any one might see him perform, Jesus adds the words, "And blessed is he who shall not be offended in me." He alludes to John the Baptist, who had sent to ask him whether he was the promised Messiah, or whether they were to look for another, and John must have asked this question when he heard of the works, *i.e.* the miraculous doings, of Jesus. If he asked the question on receiving this information, he cannot have been offended in Jesus; he must therefore have disbelieved the information, or, like the Pharisees, have considered the works of Jesus to be works of the devil; but this last, according to the account of the Evangelists, is not to be thought of. The only point he could doubt about would be whether those miracles, the like of which had been performed by prophets in the Old Testament, did also on this occasion announce only a Prophet, or, lastly and once for all, the Messiah. But this pardonable doubt could not be designated by Jesus as a being offended in him. The words seem rather to have been uttered against those who were offended at his not performing the miracles expected of the Messiah, and then the miracles to which he appealed immediately before as those which any one might see him perform, are to be understood in a spiritual sense of the moral effects of his doctrine. "How?" he means to say; "you do not see me perform the miracles which you expect from the Messiah? and yet I am daily opening, in a spiritual sense, the eyes of the blind, the ears of the deaf, making the maim walk uprightly and nimbly, and

giving new life to those that are morally quite dead. He who sees how much more worth these spiritual miracles are, will take no offence at the want of material ones; but only such an one is capable of receiving the salvation which I am offering to mankind, and is worthy of it."

Meanwhile, however Jesus might disclaim the performance of material miracles, it was supposed, according to the mode of thought of the period and of his contemporaries, that miracles he must perform, whether he would or not. As soon as he was considered a prophet (Luke vii. 16; Mark xxi. 11)—and we cannot doubt that he might attain this character as well as the Baptist even without miracles—miraculous powers were attributed to him; and when they were attributed to him they came of course into operation. From that time, wherever he shewed himself, sufferers regularly crowded upon him in order only to touch his garments, because they expected to be cured by doing so (Matt. xiv. 36; Mark iii. 10, vi. 56; Luke vi. 19). And it would have been strange indeed if there had been no cases among all these in which the force of excited imagination, impressions half spiritual, half sensuous, produced either actual removal or temporary mitigation of their complaints; and this effect was ascribed to the miraculous power of Jesus. Whether exactly such a complaint as that of the woman with the issue of blood (Matt. ix. 20 ff.), was thus curable by excitement of the imagination, may be doubted, but it is undeniable that in many cases the account given in the Gospels may exactly correspond with the facts. And when in such cases Jesus dismissed the persons cured, as he did this woman, with the words, "Thy faith hath made thee whole" (ver. 22; comp. Mark x. 52; Luke xvii. 19, xviii. 42), he could not have expressed himself more truly, more modestly, more correctly, or more precisely. Even in the account of the Evangelist, that in his home at Nazareth, by reason of the disbelief of the people, only a few cases had succeeded

(Matt. xiii. 58; Mark vi. 5), a lost trace of the correct view may be seen.

Such a mode of healing by exciting the force of imagination was especially possible in the case of a class of diseases which themselves rested half on imagination, and which were at that time the fashionable form of complaint among the Jews, possession by devils. We have seen this morbid condition re-appearing in our own days in connection with the newly arisen belief in spirits and devils. Nervous and mental perturbations, which otherwise would have appeared simply in the form of convulsions, periodical craziness and the like, appeared in connection with that superstition as madness produced by demoniacal possession, and could also only be removed by operating on this delusion. There is every probability that as to the cause of this disease Jesus shared the ideas of his age; but that it not seldom yielded to his threatening in the name of God, he considered indeed as a sign of the Messianic times (Matt. xii. 28), though he laid the less stress upon the fact (Luke x. 20) as regarded himself and his disciples, as he saw the same effect produced by others as well, whom in this respect he placed without hesitation on a par with himself (Matt. xii. 27; Luke xi. 19). The mention of diseased persons of this class, so frequent in the three first Gospels (Matt. iv. 24, viii. 16, 28 ff., ix. 32 ff., x. 1, 8, xii. 22 ff., xv. 22, xvii. 18 ff.), is entirely wanting in the fourth. And this is one of the surest proofs of its late origin and unhistorical character.

But in cases of cure of this kind by the imagination, it could not but happen sometimes that with the excitement, the prolongation of life produced by it also passed away, and the old complaints returned. Jesus also speaks of such relapses, and not merely in reference to sick persons who had been cured by himself, but quite generally, so that we may suppose they had happened to himself also among his own cures. As regards those who had been possessed, he

explains them by the return of the devil that had been driven out, with a fresh accession of strength (Matt. xii. 43—45; Luke xi. 24—26). And we see from this that he looked upon the cause of these complaints as a supernatural one, and his power of removing them as by no means absolute.

And here we are upon the boundary-line which, in the historical point of view, must be drawn in reference to this power of operation in Jesus. Not as though we could state, in the case of every individual miraculous narrative in the Gospels, whether and how far it is to be considered historical. Still we can indicate a point at which in all cases possibility ceases, because every historical analogy leaves us, every conceivability according to nature's laws is at an end. If we begin with the most extreme case, it is impossible that Jesus should ever, by a mere blessing, have enormously increased the means of nourishment, ever have changed water into wine; nor can he, in defiance of the law of gravity, have walked upon water without sinking; he cannot have recalled dead men to life; nor, unless he is to be supposed to have been a fanatic and impostor at the same time, have represented the discovery of a merely apparent death as an awaking of the dead to life. Quite as little can blindness and deafness, whether natural or otherwise, have ceased at his word of command or his touch, or leprosy have been got rid of in a moment. For we are accustomed to meet with results of this kind only in the province of fable or superstition, never on the ground of history; we find indeed that results of this kind have been sometimes believed, and believed to the extent of individuals thinking that they had not only been joint witnesses of them, but subjects of them themselves (blind men imagining that they had seen for a moment, deaf that they had heard), without the result having really occurred. Besides the supposed demoniac diseases, that is, diseases of the mind and nerves, those maladies which in the Gospels are commonly designated as cases of

paralysis, *i. e.* lameness, contraction or distortion of particular limbs or the whole body (Matt. iv. 24, viii. 6, ix. 2, 6, xii. 10; Luke xiii. 11), were most adapted to being removed wholly or partially, temporarily or entirely, by a strong impression on the mind; at least there are most striking cures of this kind generally known, and for one of them the original voucher has been brought forward by the Master of the natural mode of explanation.* Under this category of cures, partly physical, partly imaginative, and of the natural results in general of excitement in a circle influenced by strong religious impressions, we must place those miracles and signs of which the Apostle Paul speaks, partly as worked by himself, partly as being current and common in the Christian communities (1 Cor. xii. 28 ff.; 2 Cor. xii. 12).

It is an obvious question whether Jesus, partly out of love for mankind, partly in order really to perform something in a department in which he might produce effects altogether answering the expectations of his contemporaries, did not avail himself of natural remedies—whether the popular teacher was not also the popular physician—a view which in the days of enlightenment and rationalism was carried to the utmost possible extent, and at the present day (remember only Ewald's History of Christ) has not lost all its validity.

This theory has in fact, in the customs of the East as well as the Jewish people, among whom priests and prophets were always at the same time the depositaries of traditionary medical knowledge, an unmistakeable support.† At the same time, the gross ignorance and the dark superstition of the

* See Paulus, Exegetic Manual, i. 2, p. 509, and the communication in the Sophronizon there quoted.

† We may remember what Josephus says (Bell. Jud. ii. 8, 6) of the attempts at healing made by the Essenes: though the circumstance that with roots he speaks also of stones, the properties of which they examined, gives the cases rather a magic look.

people at that time makes it intelligible that even cures effected by means obviously natural were considered as miracles. In order, however, to get beyond mere possibility and general surmise on this point, we ought to find in the evangelical narrative points of support on which the supposition can rest. By the friends of the theory, all those cases were looked upon as explicable by it in which Jesus, in performing his cures, went beyond the mere word of command, and is said to have availed himself of external matter or bodily laying on of hands. He touches the tongue of a dumb man with spittle (Mark vii. 33), looks into the eyes of a blind man, lays clay made of dust and spittle on the eyes of a man born blind, and then bids him wash in a pool (John ix. 6 ff.); the cure does not in this case ensue until after the washing, but in the case of the other blind man, according to the express account of the Evangelist, by two separate applications. In all this, the use of natural means has been discerned, and also in the mere touch and laying on of hands (*e.g.* Matt. viii. 3, 15, ix. 59, xx. 34; Mark vi. 5; Luke iv. 40), supposed surgical manipulation, and, according to circumstances, operation. But nothing can be more decidedly opposed to the meaning of the evangelical reporters. In their belief, the laying on of hands in the case of the miraculous cure is the same thing as it is in that of the communication of the blessing; they see in it the transmission of the higher power from the worker of the miracle to the sick person, and even the spittle and clay must be understood, not from the history of medicine, but from that of superstition. It was to humour this that even the Emperor Vespasian, while passing the complacent procurator of Egypt, who wished to introduce him to the people of Alexandria as a favourite of heaven, was compelled to examine the eyes of a blind man, who then also did not fail to receive his eyesight on the spot.* Nor must it be overlooked that these

* Tacit. Histor. iv. 81; Sueton. Vesp.

processes, which, like the examination and the clay-making, remind us most of natural means, appear, not in the most ancient and original accounts, but in those of the latest date, and which are also, on other grounds, most open to the suspicion of unhistorical modifications—those, namely, in Mark and John. On this head, it is simply the general possibility of the result that we consider, without coming to any more definite conclusion.

We require, however, no such theory in order to explain either the position attained by Jesus or the origin of the evangelical narratives of miracles. The former he was capable of reaching by purely spiritual means; the latter are sufficiently accounted for in two ways. First, there are the miracles produced by faith, perfectly natural, and which we have not disputed; secondly, there is the inference with which we have been long familiar, drawn from what, it was supposed, must as a matter of course happen to and be done by the Messiah, to what, it was again supposed, must happen to and be done by Jesus, inclusive of the symbolical meanings of these accounts, and not merely symbolical, but also prefigurative of many tendencies of the Christian Church of later times.

43. THE DISCIPLES OF JESUS.

In his acting and teaching, Jesus had in view not merely the temporary consequences, which were all that could be aimed at in dealing with a wide and continually changing circle of people flocking to him in multitudes and then returning. It is true that we are ignorant of the length of time which he may have imagined was about to elapse before the conclusion of the present period of the world. But whether it was long or short, the movement which he was exciting in mankind was still intended by him to have the power of

attracting and reforming them to the widest possible extent. This object was not to be attained without a narrower circle of disciples, who remained continually in his society, were initiated by him into his thoughts more profoundly than the masses of the people were, and were penetrated by his spirit. It was as customary for the Hebrew prophets, and at a later period for the Rabbis, to have smaller circles of disciples round their persons, as it was for the Greek philosophers. This was the case, in particular, with the immediate forerunner of Jesus, John the Baptist; beside the multitudes that flocked to him and away from him, we find that he had around him such an unchanging circle of disciples as we are now speaking of.

We do not know, as regards the Baptist, what the number of these disciples was. In the case of Jesus, it is well known that there was the peculiarity of the circle having consisted of twelve persons. Their names are preserved in the New Testament in a quadruple catalogue (Matt. x. 2—4; Mark iii. 16—19; Luke vi. 14—16; Acts i. 13). The names are the same, but there are some variations in the order in which they are given, and one name is different. The significance of this particular number obviously lies in the allusion to the twelve tribes of the Hebrew people, even if Matthew (xix. 28) and Luke (xxii. 30) did not tell us that Jesus himself promised to his twelve disciples that on his second coming they should sit on twelve thrones and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. Matthew says nothing of a definite act of selection by which Jesus called the twelve, and what Mark (iii. 13 ff.) and Luke (vi. 12) have to tell us on this head has very much the appearance of being the product of their own imagination, founded upon the prevailing idea that the twelve were chosen by Jesus himself (comp. John vi. 70, xv. 16; Acts i. 2). On the other hand, it would be going too far to suppose that it was not until after the death of Jesus that the number of persons in the college of Apostles was fixed at twelve, and that this

limitation was to be attributed to Jewish prejudices. The number is found too early for this. Not only does the Revelation of John, written about thirty years after the death of Jesus, assume the number twelve of the Apostles as a fundamental Christian fact (xxi. 14), but also the Apostle Paul, whose first acquaintance with the sect of the Christians reaches up into the first decade after the death of Jesus, speaks of the twelve as an existing college (1 Cor. xv. 5). The circumstance of Jesus having fixed the narrower circle of his disciples at this number, proves certainly that in his plan of reform he was thinking immediately of the people of Israel, but not that he intended to confine himself to them.

The Evangelists, not even excepting those who represent the choosing of the Twelve as a single act, describe different members of this circle as following Jesus on particular occasions, either singly or in couples. And that it was so is historically very probable. But the particular occasions on which they state this to have happened, have so obviously their origin in legend or free invention, that we must defer to another time the accurate examination of them. Those who in the synoptic Gospels are distinguished by special histories of this kind are the two pairs of brothers, Simon and Andrew, sons of Jonas (Andrew is not found in Luke), and the sons of Zebedee, James and John (Matt. iv. 18—22; Mark i. 16—20; Luke v. 1—11). It is stated in these narratives that they were called away to follow Jesus from catching fish on the sea of Galilee. And of this thus much appears to be historical, that they had been fishermen on this sea. The case may be the same with the history of the calling of a publican (Matt. ix. 9 ff.; Mark ii. 13 ff.; Luke v. 27 ff.), though it is only in the Gospel of Matthew that he has a name which recurs in the lists of the Apostles, namely, that of the alleged author of that Gospel. In Mark and Luke he is called Levi. The fourth Gospel also tells how Andrew and Simon came to Jesus (i. 35 ff.), but place and

circumstances are there quite different; James is not spoken of, and John is only alluded to in that mysterious manner which is peculiar to this Gospel in reference to its alleged author or voucher. Philip and Nathanael are called in the same connection, of whom only the first is found in the Synoptic lists; the latter, by an uncertain supposition, is considered the same as the Bartholomew (lately as Matthew) of these lists. As the number twelve of the Apostles was known, and of these themselves several were very little known, it was natural that particular vacant places should be filled up with different names, as in the place of the Lebbeus-Thaddeus of the two first Evangelists there appears in the two catalogues of Luke a Judas (brother) of James.

In all the lists of Apostles, in Matthew with an express description as the first, Simon Peter stands at the head. In the narratives of all the Gospels, he is in word (Matt. xv. 15, xvi. 16, 22, xvii. 4, xviii. 21, xix. 27, xxvi. 33; John vi. 68, xii. 6, 9) and deed (Matt. xiv. 28 ff., xxvi. 58; Mark i. 36; John xviii. 16, xxi. 3—7) before the others; in all, he is distinguished by Jesus with the surname of Cephas or Peter (Matt. xvi. 18; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14; John i. 43). It is possible that a name, assigned to him on some occasion or other, should have been considered as a title of honour given to him by Jesus, or that it might not have been attributed to him until a later period by the Church. At all events, the character of a man who with much fire possessed but little firmness, as he proved not merely by his denial, but also by his subsequent position in the dispute between Jewish and heathen Christianity (Gal. ii. 11 ff.), does not appear to be very appropriately described by the surname of Man of Rock. The surname of Boanerges, or Sons of Thunder, preserved, indeed, in Mark alone (iii. 37), must appear far better suited to the two sons of Zebedee, to John especially, if the thunder-laden Revelation is really his; to both if the narrative in Luke (ix. 54) about the fire which they wished to call down from heaven

on a Samaritan village because it refused shelter to their caravan on its way to the feast, rests upon an historical foundation. The connection between them and Jesus was also particularly close, from the fact that their mother (Salome, according to Mark xv. 40; comp. with Matt. xxvii. 56) was one of the women who accompanied Jesus. And she is said to have prayed for the two highest places in the kingdom of the future Messiah for her sons (Matt. xx. 20 ff.). These three men, Peter, James, and John, with whom Mark sometimes associates Andrew, apparently on account of his being brother to Peter (i. 29, xiii. 3), we find in the three synoptic Gospels as a smaller coterie of the college of Twelve. They are taken by Jesus to different scenes, as the Transfiguration, the Agony in Gethsemane, according to Mark the raising of Jairus' daughter also. It would seem that the others were not equal to a due comprehension of these scenes, or the scenes themselves, as containing mysteries, were only to be exhibited before a few initiated persons. Of this Synoptic triumvirate, James, in the fourth Gospel, is passed over in dead silence (only the appendix, xxi. 2, mentions the sons of Zebedee); Peter, without his traditional rank being exactly depreciated, is everywhere by a subtle expression put behind the "other disciple," or "the disciple whom Jesus loved," *i.e.* John. Now this, on the supposition that the Apostle John is the author of the Gospel, is as difficult to explain, as it is easy on ours with regard to the origin of the Gospel. This shall be shewn hereafter. Even the way in which in this Gospel the posts are assigned to Philip, Andrew, and Thomas, is to all appearance altogether arbitrary, and might be occasioned by the respect attaching to these names in the tradition of the Church of Asia Minor, where Philip, for instance, was supposed to be buried in Hierapolis.*

There is, besides, one disciple who stands out from the

* Eusebius, Church History, iii. 31, 3.

circle of the Twelve in distinctive exclusiveness, to whom all the lists of the Apostles assign the last place, the traitor Judas. How Jesus came to admit into his inner circle a man who was capable of such an act and to keep him there, and how Judas came to betray his Master—all this is from the three first Evangelists not indeed conceivable, but from the fourth absolutely inconceivable. As regards Jesus, the Synoptics say also on other occasions that he saw into the thoughts of men (Matt. ix. 4; Mark ii. 8; Luke v. 22); but with regard to Judas they do not say until quite the last, when the betrayal had already taken place, that Jesus was aware of it beforehand (Matt. xxvi. 21 ff.). The fourth Evangelist, on the other hand, expressly remarks that Jesus from the first knew him who was to betray him (vi. 64); by which, humanly speaking, it becomes simply inexplicable why he did not eject him from his society. In the same way, in the Synoptic account, considering the insignificance of the sum offered to him (according to Matt. xxvi. 15, thirty pieces of silver, about £3. 15s.), the motive for his treason on the part of Judas is obscure; but when in the fourth Gospel we read of a purse belonging to the society which Judas carried and occasionally robbed (xii. 6), we cannot at all see why for one single reward he should have resigned a permanent place which was lucrative to his dishonesty. In the former case, the amount of the reward, as we shall see hereafter, is only taken from a passage of prophecy (Zech. ii. 12) falsely supposed to refer to it. And thus also in John, the dishonest bearing of the bag on the part of Judas rests probably only on an inference drawn from his treason. So likewise the statement that Jesus knew the traitor from the first, rests solely on the Logos-idea of Christ of the fourth Evangelist.

There are different explanations attempted as to the motive that could have induced Judas to betray his Master. The most common supposition is, that worldly selfish Messianic hopes had not been satisfied by Jesus; perhaps, also, that he

found himself depreciated in comparison with the three disciples preferred to him.* We do not enter upon any discussion of these assumptions, as they are entirely without support in our evangelical traditions. On the other hand, it is worth while to notice an attempt to explain the whole account of Judas and his treason as a fiction with a certain *tendency*.† Neither Paul, it is asserted, nor the Revelation of John, know anything of a traitor. Both speak absolutely of the Twelve, as if no one had ever lost his place among them (Rev. xxi. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 5); and in the account given by Paul of the institution of the last supper (1 Cor. xi. 23), in which allusion to the treason is usually supposed to be found, the surrender, they say, of Jesus to the government is described in the same terms in which Matthew (iv. 12) and Mark (i. 14) speak of the imprisonment of the Baptist, in which there was not reason at work.‡ The motive for inventing a traitor is considered by the acute author of this theory to lie in the wish of the Pauline party to make room for the Apostle of the heathen in the college of Twelve, which could not be done except by ejecting one of them, the treason of the Jewish people to Jesus being transferred to him. This, they say, was done by the author of the original Gospel, but that he only went so far as to effect what was with him merely a means, the expulsion, that is, of one of the Twelve: his real object, the introduction of Paul, was defeated by the Jewish-Christian party, who did not indeed venture to restore Judas, but filled up his place by inventing the election of Matthias, and so, a second time, barred it against Paul. But in the history of the traitor there is much indeed that is obscure, but nothing so improbable as to make so bold an hypothesis

* Thus, most lately, Renan, *Vie de Jesus*, p. 381.

† Volkmar, *The Religion of Jesus and its First Development*, pp. 260 ff., 285 ff.; *Theology historically True*, p. 75 ff.

‡ 1 Cor.: ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ, ἣ παριδίδωτο (ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς). Matt.: ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἰωάννης παριδόθη.

necessary to account for its origin. For us in particular it is inadmissible for this reason, that we are unable to persuade ourselves that Paulinism had so decisive an influence upon the original form of evangelical tradition.

The twelve disciples are called in all the Gospels Apostles as well; but only Luke (vi. 13) says expressly that Jesus himself so named them. He might do so in reference to their future destination as Evangelical Missionaries, even if he did not, in his own lifetime, send them forth on such a missionary expedition as the three first Evangelists say he did. It may be doubted on various grounds whether it was really so. In the first place, for the narrow circle which according to the Synoptic account the disciples so commissioned did not at that time overstep, Jesus' own ministry, so long as he lived, was sufficient; in the second place, as Jesus must have been very well aware, the conceptions of the Twelve were still so completely Jewish, that if they had been sent out with them they could have done nothing but counteract his object. In the third place, the directions with which Jesus is supposed to have sent them out are so much calculated for the later state of affairs after the death of Jesus, that a portion of them occurs again in the great prophetic speech about the troubles of the later times before the destruction of Jerusalem (comp. Matt. x. 17—22, with Matt. xxiv. 9—13; Mark xiii. 9 ff.; Luke xxi. 12 ff.). And the supposition forces itself upon us that this sending out of the Apostles, like so much beside that was not done until after the death of Jesus, may have been ascribed in the first instance to Jesus as his last command (Matt. xxviii. 19), and then to him when alive as a real sending out, on probation. And it is likewise not to be overlooked that only Mark (vi. 30) and Luke (ix. 10) represent the Apostles as returning from this and rendering an account to Jesus of their success.

If, in reference to the twelve Apostles, we see reason to doubt that they were sent forth in the lifetime of Jesus, but

none that they were elected, the case is very different with regard to the seventy disciples whom, according to the narrative of Luke (x. 1 ff.), Jesus is supposed to have chosen and sent out in addition to the twelve. Two things excite suspicion against this account—first, that it is found in Luke alone; secondly, what that account states. Jesus is said to have chosen the seventy after he had quitted Galilee, and with the object of sending them forth by couples into all the towns and localities to which he intended to go. By this it would appear that only the same thing is intended which was said before (ix. 52), that he sent messengers into a Samaritan village to engage lodgings for him.

One may not understand how he should have made use of seventy men for commissions of this kind, and the instruction moreover which he gives them in the sequel is not calculated for this object, but for a missionary journey; and on their return, the accounts they have to give relate to the expulsion of devils, which had nothing to do with the taking of lodgings. So also in the directions given to them, a long sojourn for the purpose of teaching on the part of the missionaries in towns and houses is spoken of, such as we know of in times subsequent to the departure of Jesus, of the Apostles, and other missionaries of the faith. But this is inconsistent with the fact that immediately after the conclusion of the instructions, the return of the disciples and the success of their mission is spoken of. Besides this, if the mission of the seventy had been a real occurrence and distinct from that of the twelve, Jesus would certainly have given them special admonitions for the road; but instead of this, we find Luke introducing here and applying as directions to the seventy a part of the instructions given to the twelve in Matthew, and of those speeches which the same Evangelist represents as following the message of the Baptist.

The third Evangelist, as was remarked, is the only one who makes mention of an election and mission of seventy disciples.

And his account is suspicious for this reason, that it stands in the closest connection with his peculiar object. In the first instance, indeed, the seventy disciples remind us of the seventy elders chosen by Moses to assist him (4 Mos. xi. 16, 25), and the author of the *Recognitions* of Clement* uses them as a proof that Jesus was really the Prophet like unto Moses promised in 5 Mos. xviii. 15. But the number seventy or seventy-two is, according to Jewish ideas, also the number of the nations of the world;† and it is quite in the manner of the third Evangelist to have understood the seventy disciples as a type of the heathen Apostles. Probably they were found in a Jewish-Christian Gospel as a copy of the seventy elders. But it would be in the former sense that he adopted them into his Gospel.‡

If we take a survey of all that we know of the twelve Apostles, partly from the New Testament, partly from scanty accounts elsewhere, and ask how far Jesus found in them competent and worthy disciples,—then, setting aside the traitor, and in the case of the others the first days of terror after the arrest and crucifixion of their Master, we shall be obliged to do justice to their faithfulness and constancy so far as we are credibly informed of their subsequent destiny. With regard to their capacity to understand their Master, to penetrate into the interior of his ideas and his life, we shall not be able to judge so favourably, and the less so the higher we place Jesus himself. The fact that in the society of such a Teacher they still, up to the day of his removal from them, could dream of the restoration of the kingdom of Israel (Luke xxiv. 21; Acts i. 6), gives us a very poor idea of their power of understanding; and the obstinate prejudice with which they afterwards opposed the admission of the heathen into

* i. 40.

† Clem. Homil. xviii. 4. Recogn. ii. 42. Epiphan. Hæres. li. 7.

‡ Comp. Baur, Canonical Gospels, p. 499 ff.; Köstlin, Synoptics, p. 264 ff.; Girörer, The Sacred Legend, i. 235; Gospels, p. 209.

the new kingdom of the Messiah, shews us at least that they were incapable of drawing, as circumstances required, the inferences involved in the principles of their Teacher. We are indeed unquestionably informed of their incompetency in the latter point of view only in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul; the first point, that they continued to cherish hopes of a temporal Messiah after the death of Jesus, we learn only from the Gospels and the Acts. And of these we are not sure how far the endeavour to bring out as strongly as possible the contrast between the want of intelligence of the Twelve on the one hand, and the superiority of Jesus and the later Apostles of the heathen on the other, may have influenced the character of the accounts they give. But if the Apocalypse is genuine, that is, a work of the Apostle John—and the external evidence at least speaks in favour of its genuineness more decisively than in the case of any other writing of the New Testament—we receive from it a mournful impression of how little Jesus was understood by one of his most confidential disciples, even setting aside “the favourite and bosom disciple” of the fourth Gospel. For we require no extended proof of the following propositions—that but little of the genuine mind of Jesus is to be met with in this book; that it is written throughout in the fiery and vengeful spirit of Elijah, repudiated by Jesus as foreign to him; and that moreover the coarse and Jewish character of its views and descriptions is far as the poles asunder from that of the Master himself, as we know it from the three first Gospels.

We have nowhere else in the New Testament any genuine composition of one of the Twelve, but the important position which Paul afterwards took up shews that Jesus among his immediate disciples had no representative who was competent to the task of following out the thoughts of his Master in a manner adapted to the development of the age. The fact that it was Paul who was obliged to take upon himself this part, a man who had never been intimate with

Jesus during his life, and indeed had probably never even seen him, had a most decisive effect upon the formation of the Christian religion. Jesus appeared to him, not in his simple historical reality, but in a light reflected by the enthusiasm of his followers, whom he persecuted; this enthusiasm, heightened by oppression, would lead them to think more of the Son of Man who was to return in the clouds than of their departed teacher, so that Paul saw him, as it were, in a vision, that is, through the medium of his own enraptured power of imagination; thus for him from the outset he was a supernatural celestial being. Such, also, was he considered by his own immediate disciples after they had overcome the intolerable fact of his crucifixion by the production of the conception of the resurrection; but in the living remembrance of his earthly ministry they had always a thread which bound their present idea of him to what is human and natural: this bond of union was wanting to Paul, so that in his case the balloon of imagination went without a resting-place through the air. The deification of Jesus was begun by Paul, who had not known him as a man, continued by those who, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, were in a like position, and completed by the author of the fourth Gospel, who was separated from him by a still greater distance of time and space.

44. THE JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM.

How far Jesus, when he entered upon the eventful journey to Jerusalem, had proceeded in the formation of his plan, and especially of the constitution of the society which had formed around him, is not precisely stated. Matthew represents him as sketching certain outlines of a future constitution of the Church before entering upon this journey. When Peter, as

spokesman of the Twelve, had put into words his conviction that their Master was the Messiah, Jesus not merely imparts to him in Matthew the surname, with the explanation that he will found his Church upon him as on a rock, but also transfers to him the power over the keys which a master of the house possesses (comp. Isa. xx. 22; Rev. iii. 7), in the kingdom of heaven, by means of which he is to have authority to open and to shut, or, as it is here expressed with an analogous image, to loose and to bind, *i.e.* to command and to forbid, with the assurance that what he ordains on earth in this manner is already settled in heaven (Matt. xvi. 17—19). At a later period (Matt. xviii. 18; comp. also John xx. 23), Jesus conveys the same authority to the disciples in general, and appoints the Church as the supreme referee in disputes between Christians. And then the use of the expression Church (Ecclesia), transports us to a time when no such thing as a Church yet existed, and the definite arrangements with regard to it, to which arrangements the exclusion of the title of Rabbi (Matt. xxiii. 8 ff.) may be added, to a later period, the institutions of which, in the shape into which they gradually moulded themselves, were referred to the express ordinance of Jesus. And in connection with this we may also recognise in the twofold statement that the supreme power of binding and loosing is conveyed at one time to Peter, at another time to the disciples in general, the reflection of different stages and standpoints in the development of the most ancient constitution of the Church.

The accounts of the journey of Jesus to Jerusalem say nothing of the object which he had in view in undertaking it, or rather represent his passion and death as the immediate object (Matt. xvi. 21, xx. 18). We must therefore endeavour to gather it in the steps he took on the occasion of, and after, his first entrance into the capital. These are, in the first instance, his solemn entrance into it (Matt. xx. 1—11; Mark xi. 1—10; Luke xix. 29—38; John xii. 12—19), and

the purification of the Temple connected with it, of the last of which we have already spoken. With the first it is well known that Reimar has connected the accusation of a political attempt, by which Jesus wished to set himself up as a ruler with the support of his countrymen. On the other hand, the historical character of the occurrence has been called in question, and the narrative has been derived partly from the prophecy of Zechariah (ix. 9), quoted by Matthew and John, partly from the supposed intention of contrasting this entrance with the military entrance of the Apocalyptic Christ (Rev. xix. 11 ff.). It is possible that the riding in upon the ass might have come into the evangelical narrative from that prophecy, but that the solemn entrance of Jesus with the Hosannas of the people might still be historical. It may also be supposed, however, that Jesus, who certainly did not wish in all respects to disclaim the character of Messiah, may, in opposition to the prevailing view of that Messiah as a terrible military hero, have wished to support himself on the passage of Zechariah, which appeared to represent him as a mild prince of peace. A political allusion is not necessarily involved in this; he who enters unarmed with unarmed followers must either be already acknowledged as a ruler, or he must intend to be so in a sense and by means which exclude all external force, so that the princely element on his entrance appears only as the higher consecration of his office as teacher and reformer. According to the accounts of the three first Evangelists, it was the Galilean caravan going to the feast with which Jesus travelled, and which consisted for the most part of disciples and adherents of their native prophets, that as he approached the capital strewed the road with branches of trees and garments, and by saluting him as the Son of David, offered that homage by which the whole city was thrown into commotion. There would be no inherent improbability in the statement of the fourth Gospel, that on the intelligence of

the arrival of the prophet from Galilee the visitors also at the feast moved out of the town in order to prepare for him a solemn reception, but it becomes doubtful from the connection into which it is here brought with the raising of Lazarus.

In the procession of this host of adherents, Jesus went straight to the Temple, and there commenced that act which so sensibly interfered with a custom closely connected with the sacrificial system of the Jews: in the days immediately following, he delivered speeches in which the dominant parties of Pharisees and priests were most sharply attacked, their hypocrisy, their pride, their avarice, were unsparingly exposed, the people called upon to avoid them, and threats held out to themselves of divine punishment, of the calling of other and more faithful labourers into the vineyard of the Lord (Matt. xxiii., comp. xxi. 33—41). Considering all this, we may easily understand how steps of this sort might excite the anxiety of the spiritual lords, and cause them to form plans for relieving themselves of so dangerous an opponent—plans, the execution of which for a time was only defeated by the important party of popular adherents which still clung to him (Matt. xxi. 15 ff., 45 ff.; Mark xi. 18, xii. 12; Luke xix. 47 ff., xx. 19; John xii. 19).

We can only conjecture in what way Jesus intended to approach the execution of his purpose during his stay in the capital, as our Evangelists, taking their stand upon the issue and the later dogmatic point of view, gave a turn to the history intended to convey the impression that he calculated upon nothing but the failure of his exertions and his own speedy fall. This he might certainly have had a foreboding of, and have prepared himself for the worst; but still as an intelligent man he must have had a scheme in readiness in case of his success, though that became more improbable every day. In general, we cannot imagine this to have been any other, but that he considered it possible gradually to

advance the Jewish people so far by means of moral and religious teaching, that they would extricate themselves more and more from the system of external ceremonies, purification, and perhaps also sacrifices, withdraw themselves at the same time from the guardianship of their former spiritual superiors, and entrust themselves to the guidance of men whose minds had been educated in the spirit of genuine inward piety. The success which he had already met with in this direction in his native province suggested to him that he was under the necessity of placing himself in the foreground of the battle that was to be waged against the opposing power, and to do this at a time when the number of persons present at the Feast offered him, so far as they were his Galilean countrymen, support, and so far as they were foreign Jews, an opportunity of making his ideas rapidly known to the widest possible circle. But it cannot be supposed that he had expected, in the short week of the Passion, to attain his final object—the reform of the whole system of the national religion. Perhaps he may at least have hoped by his activity in teaching during this period to gain so much ground in the capital as to be able to continue there afterwards, working on for the completion of his purpose; or he intended to return home again to Galilee after the Feast, so as to allow the seeds which he had sown in the metropolis to germinate for a time, and again to take up the interrupted task at future Festivals. But everything, as was said, is pure conjecture. It is, however, due to Jesus to suppose something of the kind indicated to have been intended by him in order to remove the appearance of his having necessarily been, if we once quit the evangelical view of the circumstances, either an unsuccessful revolutionary or an enthusiast with no plan at all.

After a sojourn of several days in Jerusalem, during which he was accustomed to pass the nights outside of the city, sometimes in Bethany, sometimes in the Mount of Olives

(Matt. xxi. 17; Mark xi. 11 ff.; Luke xxi. 37), the account of the first Evangelist tells us that two days before the beginning of the Feast, the High-priests, Scribes, and Elders, met in council in the house of Caiaphas the High-priest, in order to consider how they might stealthily arrest Jesus, and cause him to be put to death (Matt. xxvi. 1—5; comp. Mark xiv. 1 ff.; Luke xxiii. 1). But the popular favour which they saw him enjoying made the execution of such a step during the days of the Feast, when the capital was crowded with multitudes of foreign and especially Galilean pilgrims, unadvisable, for fear of a popular tumult; and as the expression, not on the feast-day, can hardly be understood of the execution of so important an object before the beginning of the Feast, the hierarchs appear to have expected that Jesus would remain in the metropolis after the Feast, when the other visitors went home.

Here, then, according to the unanimous report of the Gospels, the operation of the traitor comes in. Jesus, as has been said, was accustomed to take his night's rest outside the city. The reason of this may have been the over-crowding of the lodgings in the city during the Feast; it may also have been, especially as he appears to have changed the places, for the purpose of escaping from the plots of his enemies. Even though these would in any case have reached him at last, still a man must have been welcome to them from the circle immediately around Jesus, who offered to lead their myrmidons to the place where he had passed that particular night (Matt. xxvi. 14 ff.; Mark xiv. 10; Luke xxii. 3 ff.; John xviii. 2 ff.; Acts i. 16). We know not the price at which they bought this treason, for the thirty pieces of silver, as was observed before, are taken from a passage in a Prophet which was referred to the treason of Judas.

The execution of the plot is definitely placed by the three first Gospels on the 14th Nisan, with the evening of which the first and most solemn day of the Passover began. Quite as definitely by the fourth Evangelist on the 13th, the evening

before the beginning of the Festival (Matt. xxvi. 17 ff.; Mark xiv. 12 ff.; Luke xxii. 7 ff.; John xiii. 1 ff.). Both authorities represent Jesus as taking a meal with his disciples on this evening, immediately before setting forth to the place where his arrest occurred. This meal, according to the Synoptics, was the Passover; not so according to John, as a meal on the evening of the 13th could not be the Passover. The Synoptics accordingly represent Jesus as celebrating the supper in connection with the usage of the eating of the Passover. Of this John says nothing, representing him as performing on his disciples another symbolical act—the washing of their feet. Still, both authorities mean undoubtedly one and the same meal. This is clear from the fact that they not only designate it as the last that Jesus partook of with his followers, and as that from which he set forth immediately on his way to be arrested, but also represent the treason of Judas and the denial of Peter as having been predicted at it. Only one of these statements can of course be correct; but which of the two is so, is a question of more importance from a critical and explanatory than from an historical point of view. As regards the credibility, and in particular the origin, of the Gospel of John, the answer to it is decisive; but on a simply historical point of view it is of little consequence on what day the arrest and crucifixion of Jesus took place, and whether his last meal with his disciples was the Passover or not. Here, therefore, we leave it for a time undecided, reserving for a later period the task of making it clear how the variation may have come into the reports of our Gospels.

45. LAST SUPPER, ARREST, AND CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS.

The description of the last evening passed by Jesus with the disciples is in all the Evangelists sketched upon the sup-

position that he knew accurately beforehand in all its circumstances what was immediately to happen to him (comp. John xiii. 1, xviii. 4). This assumption was the natural result to the fullest extent of their conception of Jesus as the Messiah divinely begotten, or the creative Word become incarnate. From our point of view, it must be limited to what is humanly possible and historically probable. Jesus might have foreseen that his end was approaching; he might, indeed, have had his suspicions against the faith of one, the constancy of another, of his disciples, and not have concealed them. But he is also said to have known decidedly beforehand, and to have declared, that on this very night his destiny will be fulfilled, to have expressly pointed out Judas as the traitor, to have predicted to Peter a threefold denial of him before the next crowing of the cock. Of all this, the first might be explained on the supposition of certain hints having been given by secret adherents in the high Council, of which, however, there is no trace in the accounts. But every part of it is as difficult to conceive historically as it is easy to explain psychologically (as we shall find hereafter) how his adherents came in the sequel to conceive that all had taken place as represented in the Gospels.

The institution of the Supper (Matt. xxvi. 26--29; Mark xiv. 22--25; Luke xxii. 19 ff.), with its images of death, is readily conceivable from the forebodings which must have impressed themselves upon the mind of Jesus, having as he had a correct knowledge of his situation in those days. He saw himself on the one hand surrounded by powerful enemies, highly exasperated against him, whose fanaticism was capable of all extremes; only, on the other hand, most imperfectly understood by his most intimate friends; to say nothing of the fact of his having already gone so far with the mass of the people that he might consider them as decidedly gained over to his side, as a sure rallying-point against the attacks of his enemies. Thus, when he broke the loaf of bread, in

the character of Master of the House, in order to distribute it among his followers, the image of his own body, for which in all probability a similar fate was intended by his angry enemies, might occur to his mind ; likewise, on pouring out the ruddy wine, the image of his blood, which would shortly flow in the same manner. He might, in a spirit of foreboding, assert to his disciples that the same thing would soon be done to him that he was then doing to the bread and wine, and that they might, as often as they partook together of bread and wine, think of him and what he was then saying to them. Plunged, thus, in the thought of his immediate death, he might consider it at the same time in the light of a sacrificial death, his blood as the initiation of a new covenant between God and man, and in order to give to the society which he wished to found a living centre, he might institute this distribution of bread and wine as a solemnity to be repeated.

All this was naturally possible. But it is another question whether everything did really take place as the Evangelists tell us. The silence indeed of the fourth is, from our own point of view of him, no proof of the negative ; on the other hand, the evidence of the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23—25) does not tell so decidedly in favour of the positive side as is generally assumed. Paul gives the tradition with regard to the institution of the supper as he found it already in the Church on his entrance into that body. But it is not so easy to decide how much of this tradition came from the original occurrence, and how much from the Christian custom that subsequently arose. If on that evening Jesus distributed bread and wine in accordance with the Jewish custom at the Feast, and connected therewith any allusion whatever to the violent death that threatened him, and if the custom subsequently arose in the Church of repeating this distribution in memory of his death, it was a natural consequence to put into the mouth of Jesus himself the institution of this repeti-

tion ("Do this as often as you drink it," &c.). If it had been customary in the Church to see in the bread and wine in that memorial meal, the body and blood of Christ, and in the latter the blood of a new covenant, it would be supposed that Jesus had himself designated those substances accordingly, and in later times, from the point of view of the Christian custom, the occurrence might so present itself to the mind even of those who, like the Apostles, had been witnesses of that last evening. But the repetition of the meal was brought close to the first Christians, even without any institution on the part of Jesus, partly by the annually recurring Passover, partly, and still more, by the sacred supper of the Essenes, which was repeated weekly, and with especial solemnity every seven weeks. Only that the Christians, in place of the water that was used with the bread at the supper of the Essenes, substituted wine in connection with the Paschal rite.

Of the scene on the Mount of Olives which the Evangelists represent as following immediately upon the last supper (Matt. xxvi. 30 ff.; Mark xiv. 21 ff.; Luke xxii. 39 ff.; John xviii. 1 ff.), thus much is without doubt historical, that Jesus was arrested by officers of the Jewish Sanhedrim, acting under the guidance of a traitorous disciple, without serious resistance. On the other hand, that which in the Synoptic accounts precedes the arrest, the so-called Agony with its three repetitions in Matthew and Mark, the angel and the bloody sweat in Luke, are at all events mythically much embellished, if not altogether fictitious. But even the general proposition that Jesus, on that evening before his suffering and death, felt fear, and only mastered this feeling after a violent inward struggle, proceeds upon the assumption that he foresaw certainly and accurately what awaited him in the hours immediately succeeding. This assumption creates a difficulty; for the Evangelists represent the foreknowledge as something supernatural, such as we cannot imagine; but as

a natural anticipation it was scarcely so definite and certain as to produce such a mental emotion in the hour before the occurrence of the foreboded event. We may, perhaps, assume as historical just thus much, that when at that last moment the thought of a violent death was pressing more and more upon the mind of Jesus, the terror of that idea threw dark shadows over his soul, and he had need to summon up all his moral force, to revive his feeling of resignation to the fatherly love of God, and the consciousness of his calling, in order to maintain in the face of this extremity his tranquil and heaven-inspired presence of mind.

In the succeeding narrative of the trial and condemnation of Jesus (Matt. xxvi. 57, xxvii. 31 ; Mark xiv. 53, xv. 20 ; Luke xxii. 54, xxiii. 25 ; John xviii. 12, xix. 16), all the Evangelists have in common the following particulars: That Jesus was first tried before the Jewish authorities and found guilty, then taken before the Roman Procurator, who is said to have confirmed and completed the sentence of death, but not to have been able immediately to convince himself of the guilt of the accused, and, after repeated attempts to save him, yielding at last to the violent importunity of the Jews, to have given the order for his crucifixion. The guilt of Jesus before the Jewish tribunal appears in the two first Gospels in the form of evidence, stated to be false, to the effect that he had said that he would destroy the Temple of God, and in three days build it up again, *i.e.* as was explained above, he was accused of an attack upon the existing system of the Jewish religion. Now this, certainly, in the sense of any violent means that he might be supposed to have had in view, was a false accusation ; but as to the latter object, not altogether without foundation. Then he is asked whether he asserts himself to be the Messiah. He answers in the affirmative, appealing to Ps. cx. and Daniel vii. This is considered as blasphemy, and a crime worthy of death. In the presence of the Roman Governor, the Jewish authorities

availed themselves, according to the unanimous account of the Evangelists, of the political side, offered by the conception of the Messiah as King of the Jews, in order to represent the accused in the character of an agitator of the people against the Roman power. In this, though not without difficulty, as Pilate could not discover in Jesus any signs of a man politically dangerous, they at last succeeded. In all this there is nothing historically improbable; though we cannot overlook the fact that the resistance of Pilate is worked out with especial industry by the Evangelists in order to bring out into strong relief the innocence of Jesus on the one hand, and the obstinate wickedness of the Jews on the other. We shall return, therefore, to this subject in a subsequent examination, as well as to all the more accurate details of these scenes in the Gospels.

So also in the description which the Evangelists give of the crucifixion of Jesus (Matt. xxvii. 31 ff.; Mark xv. 20 ff.; Luke xxiii. 25 ff.; John xviii. 16 ff.), we have here nothing to do with any of those features which are only intended to get from the natural as well as human world, the curtain of the Temple and the sacred Scriptures, testimonies in favour of the innocence of the Crucified, and against his murderers. We only keep to this, that he was fastened to the cross, and taken down from it again, after having been generally considered dead. As to the proof of the reality of his death, the question comes especially under consideration, how long before as well as after it had apparently occurred, he hung upon the cross. For crucifixion, in which the loss of blood occasioned by the wounds of the nails was so slight, was not a punishment that killed quickly. Neither was it intended to be so, but, from its tediousness, so much the more painful. The longer therefore, in the first place, Jesus hung alive upon the cross, so much the more probable is it that when at last the signs of life had ceased, there was a real cessation of life; and, in the next place, the longer he continued to hang, so

much the more certainly must that which had been perhaps for a certain time only an apparent death, have been real. On the other hand, if after a few hours he appeared to be dead, and was immediately taken down from the cross, his death might possibly have been only apparent, and a condition from which he might again recover. Now from Matthew (xxvii. 45 ff.) and Luke (xxiii. 44) we only know that Jesus must have hung upon the cross alive above three hours, for they have told in every variety of words what happened while he was hanging there; they represent about the sixth hour (*i.e.* twelve o'clock at noon) a darkness as coming on, and this continuing till about the ninth hour (three o'clock P.M.), after which they state the death of Jesus to have occurred. According to Mark (xv. 25), Jesus would be crucified about the third hour (*i.e.* nine A.M.), and would consequently have hung alive upon the cross six hours. On the other hand, John (xviii. 28) represents Pilate as not pronouncing the sentence until about the sixth hour, *i.e.* at noon, when, according to the Synoptics, the sun grew dark over Jesus already hanging on the cross; and if, as must have been the case, it took some time to lead him off and crucify him, while, on the other hand, before the beginning of the following day, *i.e.* according to the Jewish reckoning, before six o'clock in the evening, Joseph of Arimathea is supposed to have begged the body of Jesus, and, after obtaining permission, to have taken it away, there would be at the most from two to three hours during which Jesus would have hung upon the cross before the symptoms of life had ceased, and probably still less after they had done so.

According to Mark (xv. 44), Pilate had himself expressed surprise at the death of Jesus having occurred so soon, but had learnt from the officer on guard that it had really taken place; according to John (xix. 31 ff.), he had, at the request of the Jews, sent soldiers in order to break the bones of the three who had been crucified together, so as to ensure their

death, and make their removal practicable before the opening of the following feast and Sabbath-day ; instead of which, one of the soldiers, finding Jesus already dead, only stabbed him in the side with a spear, which was followed by blood and water flowing out. It has been supposed that in this stab was involved the most certain proof of the reality of the death of Jesus ; but not only is the alleged consequence an impossibility, but it also appears in the fourth Gospel, in which it is found exclusively, interwoven with so much miraculous and prophetico-mystical pedantry, that it can have no weight whatever as an historical element, and can only come under consideration with the rest of the unhistorical embellishment of this part of the evangelical history. The proof of the reality of the death of Jesus, which certainly cannot be given in a sufficient form on the side of his crucifixion, is contained in the deficiency of all satisfactory proof of his resurrection. If *he* is to be considered as having really died, of whose continuance in life there is no historical information, the death of Jesus on the cross must be considered to have been a real death.

The reality of his death is not immediately affected by the question, treated of already from many points of view, whether only the hands or the feet also of the crucified Jesus were nailed to the cross. For the possibility of an apparent death would not be excluded even in the latter case, as the nailing of the feet was unaccompanied by any hemorrhage ; but the wanderings which Jesus, according to the evangelical accounts, is said to have undertaken on the day of his resurrection, from the sepulchre into the city, then into the country to Emmaus, three hours distant, then in the evening again into the city, and soon as far as Galilee—these he could not have undertaken naturally if he had had in his feet suppurating and painful wounds. The theology, therefore, which looks at the resurrection as a natural recovery from an apparent death, *i.e.* at the present day not only the

few declared Rationalists, but also the many who are so, but being ashamed to declare themselves conceal their opinions, are strongly interested in this question, and indeed in its being decided in favour of the nailing of hands alone.* On our point of view, we have no reason to favour either the one side or the other. As regards the Evangelists, the two first on this question give us no assistance; when in Luke (xxiv. 39) the risen Jesus shews his hands and his feet by way of proof that he is not a disembodied spirit, but the real Jesus whom they knew, and calls upon them to touch the wounds, we naturally think of those which were still visible in both sets of members. In John, on the other hand, by whom, together with the wound in the side, only the nail marks in the hands are spoken of, we have reason for supposing that only the latter were pierced. Of contemporary writers, Josephus, often as he has occasion to speak of crucifixions in his *History of the Jewish War*, gives us no definite information on the point in question. Fathers of the Church, who likewise had opportunities of seeing persons crucified, Justin,† Tertullian,‡ and others, do indeed represent the feet as having been nailed. But possibly the ground of this may be, that they knew this to be the custom in crucifying, or possibly that they might be able to quote the passage, Ps. xx. 17, "They pierced my hands and my feet," as having been fulfilled in Jesus. In the well-known passage of Plautus,§ finally, where a double nailing of the hands as well as of the feet is spoken of, many suppose the threatened increase in the severity of the punishment to consist, not in both sets of limbs being nailed with two sets of nails each instead of one, but in the two feet being exceptionally nailed as well as the two hands, as was the usual custom. Everything considered, the

* Comp. Paulus' Essay, *Two Nails less in the Coffin of Rationalism*—literary article in the *General Ecclesiastical Gazette*, No. 135. Also Schleiermacher, in the *Lectures on the Life of Jesus*.

† Dial. c. Tryph. 97. ‡ Adv. Marcion. iii. 19. § Mostellaria, ii. 1, 13.

nailing of the feet as well as the hands may be the most probable; but still, in the absence of any certain proof, the question must stand upon its own merits. Already in the time of the Apostle Paul it was a Christian tradition (1 Cor. xv. 4) that Jesus was buried after being taken down from the cross. Nor has this tradition, historically, anything against it. For though, according to the Roman custom, persons who had been crucified were accustomed to hang until they wasted away from weather, or were consumed by birds and putrefaction, and the Jewish law required that they should be taken down before evening and buried in some dishonourable burying-place, there was a Roman law which gave the bodies of criminals so executed to their relations or friends if they themselves asked for them. No one of the Evangelists says that Jesus' own disciples did this with regard to the body of Jesus; all, on the other hand, represent a man who stood only in a distant relation to Jesus—the rich Joseph of Arimathea—as here coming in. There are, indeed, different statements as to the mode in which the burial was performed, which give rise to doubt, and reserve the point for a later investigation, under which, also, the isolated notice of Matthew as to the watch at the grave will fall.

46. THE RESURRECTION. UNSATISFACTORINESS OF THE EVANGELICAL ACCOUNTS.

According to all the Gospels, Jesus, after having been buried on the Friday evening, and lain during the Sabbath in the grave, came out of it restored to life at day-break on Sunday (Matt. xxviii. 1 ff.; Mark xvi. 1 ff.; Luke xxiv. 1 ff.; John xx. 1 ff.). It is not said that any one participated in the sight of this occurrence. Even Matthew, who places watchmen at the grave, represents them as being blinded by the brilliancy of the angel who descends from heaven to roll

away the stone, and falling down dead, consequently as being incapable of seeing how the angel performed his task and Jesus issued from the sepulchre. But soon after, according to all the Evangelists, more or fewer women come to the sepulchre, where they find the stone already rolled away, and upon this are made acquainted by one or more angels with the resurrection of Jesus, which is soon after proved by several appearances of Jesus himself.

Here then we stand on that decisive point where, in the presence of the accounts of the miraculous resurrection of Jesus, we either acknowledge the inadmissibility of the natural and historical view of the life of Jesus, and must consequently retract all that precedes, and so give up our whole undertaking, or pledge ourselves to make out the possibility of the result of these accounts, *i.e.* the origin of the belief in the resurrection of Jesus, without any corresponding miraculous fact. The more immediately this question touches all Christianity to the quick, the more regard we must pay to the sensibility with which every unprejudiced word that is uttered about it is received, and even to the sensible effect which such words may have upon him who pronounces them; but the more important the point is, and the more decisive on the other side, for the whole view of Christianity, the more pressing is the demand upon the investigator to set aside all these considerations, and pronounce upon it in a perfectly unprejudiced, perfectly decided spirit, without ambiguity and without reserve.

For ordinary theology, not hampered by faith in the mere letter, this portion of evangelical history is the field in which it develops all its powers of saying nothing in many words, or of saying something quite different from what the words mean. Here, a Hase distorts phrases in order to conceal his inclination to assume that the death of Jesus was only apparent; an Ewald veils his thoughts under the most bombastic language, in order to prevent its being observed

that on this point, the most important of all, he is of the same opinion with the author of "The Life of Jesus critically discussed," for whom he is incessantly expressing his contempt. All this is only what we might expect. But even Baur himself has vouchsafed to declare that the real nature of the Resurrection of Jesus lies outside the limits of historical investigation,* and has accordingly, at least in words, avoided the burning question. For his words appear to mean that it cannot be historically discovered, and that it is not even a problem for historical investigation, to find out whether the Resurrection of Jesus was an objective occurrence, either miraculous or natural, or whether it was only the belief of his disciples. But of this much, at any rate, Baur was convinced, that in no respect was the first of these alternatives the case, that in no respect was the Resurrection an objective occurrence; consequently the second resulted as a matter of course. The saving clause that he was convinced of this, not as an historian, but as a philosopher, was in part irrelevant, in part sophistry. For, traced only historically, he must acknowledge that the accounts of the Resurrection given in the New Testament are insufficient to prove a real resuscitation of the crucified Jesus; but so much of philosophy as is required here and elsewhere to disprove a miracle is indispensable for the historian, and has been everywhere applied by Baur especially as an historian. It is something very different, and said by Baur in a genuinely historical spirit, when he states, in connection with the same subject, that the necessary historical hypothesis for all that follows is not so much the real element in the Resurrection of Jesus as the faith in it. That is a hint for the apologists who would like to persuade the world that if the reality of the Resurrection is not recognised, the origin and rise of the Christian Church cannot be explained. No, says the historian, and rightly, only thus much need be acknowledged, that the disciples

* Christianity of the Three First Centuries, p. 39.

firmly believed that Jesus had arisen; this is perfectly sufficient to make their further progress and operations intelligible; what that belief rested upon, what there was real in the resurrection of Jesus, is an open question, which the investigator may answer one way or another, without the origin of Christianity being thereby made more or less conceivable.

The origin of that faith in the disciples is fully accounted for if we look upon the resurrection of Jesus, as the Evangelists describe it, as an external miraculous occurrence; *i.e.* if we suppose that Jesus really died, was recalled to life by God by an act of his omnipotence, or rather transported by him into a new and higher kind of existence, in which he could indeed exercise his influence in a material and perceptible manner on his followers on earth, but, being no longer subject to death, was soon taken up into heaven into the immediate neighbourhood of God. But we are prevented by various reasons from adopting this view as our own. Whether we consider miracles in general as possible or not, if we are to consider a miracle of so unheard-of a description as having really occurred, it must be proved to us by evidence in such a manner that the untruth of such evidence would be more difficult to conceive than the reality of that which it was intended to prove. Now the assumption that any one of our Gospels had for its author either an Apostle or any eye-witness at all of the life of Jesus, is one which was not proved in what has gone before. The only book in the New Testament, the authorship of which by one of the twelve Apostles we found to be at all events possible, the Revelation of John, does not carry us further than the general belief that Jesus was put to death, and is now living in immortality (i. 5—18, ii. 8, &c.).

The earliest writer who gives us any accurate information as to how the belief in the resurrection of Jesus arose among his disciples is the Apostle Paul, who was not an eye-witness

of the original phenomena which were the ground of this belief, but, as he himself says, relates what he heard from others. He tells them (1 Cor. xv. 3—7) how he had “received” that Jesus who had died and been buried according to the Scriptures, had risen again on the third day according to the Scriptures, and that he had appeared to Cephas, then to the Twelve, then to more than five hundred brethren at once, then to James, then to all the Apostles. There is no occasion to doubt that the Apostle Paul had heard this from Peter, James, and perhaps from others concerned (comp. Gal. i. 18 ff., ii. 9), and that all of these, even the five hundred, were firmly convinced that they had seen Jesus who had been dead and alive again. If, however, we ask, as we must be allowed to do, the question referring to this belief in something so unheard-of, how these men convinced themselves that their supposed sight did not rest on a delusion, our voucher leaves us in the lurch. He only says simply that the Jesus who was alive again had “appeared”* to them—that is, that they thought they perceived him, and perceived him in a visible form; but he does not tell us how they arrived at this belief, what grounds they had for considering the appearance as something real, and indeed as the appearance of their Master who was dead. And it may be doubted whether he had investigated this point for himself. After he had himself witnessed that apparition of Christ, which we shall have to discuss further on, he was so sure of his case, so satisfied in his own behalf, and so sufficiently instructed, that he let three years go by before he started from Damascus, in the neighbourhood of which he had had the vision, to go for the first time to Jerusalem, to get more accurate information about Jesus in general, and in particular about those appearances of him after his death which others also professed to have had (Gal. i. 18 ff.). We must assume that he had heard in many ways of these appearances even at

* ὡφθη.

an earlier period, while he was persecuting the confessors of the new Christ; but it is quite as clear that in his then impassioned state of mind he was not qualified calmly to investigate what was real in them. And after his conversion, he felt no impulse leading him to such an investigation; on the contrary, he could satisfy himself for three whole years with what he thought he had himself seen and heard. Now this proves sufficiently the pure subjectivity of the whole turn his mind had taken, how little adapted he was, generally, to undertake the historical investigation of an objective fact. Indeed, he regularly boasts that he looked for nothing beyond that apparition, that even in Jerusalem he conversed with none of the Apostles excepting Peter, and James the brother of the Lord. These may have told him of the appearances which they could boast of having witnessed, perhaps even one or two of the five hundred brethren may have spoken to him of what they thought they had observed. But that he should have instituted a more accurate investigation with regard to these statements, have tested the foundations of them, their consistency with themselves and with each other, is not to be expected of a man who, already convinced to superfluity by the supposed apparition which he had seen himself, was also to a certain degree jealous as to the admissibility of this subjective conviction.

As regards the first point, therefore, the statement of an eye-witness with regard to the appearances upon which the belief in the Resurrection of Jesus originally rested, we have it not. In the second place, the witness with regard to whom we might assume that he drew his information from the lips of eye-witnesses, the Apostle Paul, does not lead us beyond the fact that these eye-witnesses firmly believed that they had seen Jesus returned to life. If we would learn anything more accurate we must turn to the Evangelists, and they are witnesses not one of whom we can unhesitatingly assume that, like the Apostle Paul, he received his informa-

tion from the lips of eye-witnesses. Their evidence, therefore, has not, *à priori*, the weight which it must have to counterbalance that of the improbability of the fact to which it testifies. Add to this, that the narratives of the Evangelists contradict in many ways not only the accounts of the Apostle Paul, but also each other. This Apostle says nothing of the appearances of Jesus before women, who in the Evangelists, Luke excepted, stand in the foreground (Matt. xxviii. 9; Mark xvi. 9; John xx. 14 ff.). This may be explained upon the supposition that he only wished to appeal to the testimony of men, in the same way as the author of the supplement to the fourth Gospel does not take in the appearance of Jesus before Mary Magdalene, which is mentioned in this Gospel. Luke (xxiv. 34) as well as Paul states Peter to have been the first (man, if we will have it so) to whom an appearance of the newly-risen Jesus was accorded. But neither Matthew nor even John knew anything of such an appearance having been accorded to Peter, but speak only of that before the Apostles collectively (Matt. xxviii. 16; Mark xvi. 16; comp. John xx. 19, 26), which Paul separates from the appearance to Peter. He says nothing of the appearance to the two disciples going into the country, of which Luke (xxiv. 13 ff.) and Mark (xvi. 12) give an account. This may be supposed to be accounted for by the fact that, as compared with the appearance to the Apostles on the one hand and the five hundred brethren on the other, this seemed to him to be of but little importance. But this last, again, is unknown to the Evangelists, as is also a special appearance to James, of which Paul makes mention, but which is found only elsewhere in the Gospel of the Hebrews. Finally, a second appearance before the Apostles collectively, with which Paul concludes his enumeration, is not found at all events in the three first Evangelists; but in John, where on the first occasion, Thomas being absent, only ten Apostles were present, Jesus appears eight days later, once to the full College of eleven; and in

the introduction to the Acts of the Apostles, where for the first time the presence of the risen Jesus upon earth is extended to forty days, time is indeed given for all possible appearances, but at the price of a complete contradiction with the earlier account of the same author in the Gospel, where the last appearance of Jesus after his resurrection takes place, unmistakeably, on the day of the resurrection itself.

Up to this point an opponent might maintain that neither Paul nor any one of the Evangelists undertakes to mention all the appearances after the resurrection. But this defence is not available for the fourth Evangelist, as regards the author of the 21st chapter, who particularises the appearances up to the third (xxi. 14). There would be, then, that before the eleven (xx. 19 ff.; the absence of Thomas may be considered as unimportant), consequently the second of St. Paul the first; that before the full College of the Apostles (xx. 26 ff.), therefore the fifth of Paul, the second; the appearances to Peter and James, the first and fourth in Paul, are omitted, it might be said because only concerning one Apostle; but why that before five hundred brethren, among whom, in all probability, the eleven also were? while that to the seven Apostles on the sea of Galilee (xxi. 1 ff.) is not considered too unimportant to be mentioned as the third appearance, though nothing corresponding to it is found either in Paul or in any of the other Evangelists. The author does not say that this was the last appearance, and moreover what he represents Jesus as saying on the occasion of it is not such that a later appearance is thereby absolutely excluded. But, on the other hand, in the three other Evangelists the last meeting of Jesus with his disciples, mentioned in every one of them, is obviously meant to be the last that ever took place, as it contains the last arrangements and promises of Jesus, and besides this concludes, in Mark and Luke, with the ascension. And this last appearance is by Matthew (who knows no more than John anything about an ascension) as decidedly placed

in Galilee, and by Luke, and obviously also by Mark, in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem. Of these two accounts, therefore, one, in any case, must rest upon a mistake.

But the contradiction in respect of locality does not attach merely to this last meeting, but penetrates the whole history of the appearances after the resurrection. The Apostle Paul does not define the place of the appearances mentioned by him; in Matthew, Jesus shews himself only to the two Marys on the morning of the resurrection on the way from the sepulchre to the town, consequently near Jerusalem; through them he gives the same directions to the disciples as they had received from him during his lifetime (xxvi. 32), and also from an angel (xxviii. 7), to go to Galilee, where he immediately appears to them also (xxviii. 9 ff., 16 ff.), according to the opinion of the Evangelists, undoubtedly for the first and last time. In direct contradiction with this, Luke represents Jesus on the day of the resurrection as appearing not merely to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, and to Peter, and then immediately after to all the eleven, with some few others (probably the brothers of Jesus and the women, Acts i. 14) in Jerusalem, but also as giving them the express direction to remain here in the city until power shall be given them from above. This the author of the Acts represents as not taking place until Pentecost, that is, seven weeks after (xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4). It will not do to reconcile this contradiction, as Mark does, by saying that the angel first commissioned the women to direct the disciples to Galilee as the place where they were to see him, and that then, we know not why, Jesus shewed himself to them in and near Jerusalem (xvi. 7 ff.); but if Luke is correct in the statement that Jesus on the day of the resurrection directed the disciples to remain in Jerusalem, he cannot, as Matthew says, have told them on the very same morning to go to Galilee, and as they would not have gone there against his express directions, they cannot have seen the appearances there of which Matthew

and the author of the supplementary chapter in John give an account. Conversely, if Jesus had defined Galilee to the disciples as the place where they were to see him, it is impossible to imagine what could have induced him to shew himself to them on the same day in Jerusalem: if, therefore, Matthew is correct, all the three other appearances to the disciples, which took place in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, vanish into nothing. We have, beside, the following secondary contradictions. According to Luke (xxiv. 1 ff.), Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, Joanna, and some few other women, go to the sepulchre, see in it two angels, and after their return proclaim to the Apostles and all the others what they had seen and heard, according to Mark (xvi. 1 ff.), only three women, among them Salome, instead of Joanna, take this course, see one angel in the sepulchre, and afterwards, from fear, say nothing to any one; according to Matthew (xxviii. 1 ff.), only the two first-named women find an angel sitting on the stone of the sepulchre that had been rolled away, and afterwards on their return meet with Jesus himself; while according to John (xx. 1 ff.), it was Mary Magdalene, single and alone, who went out, and on the first occasion saw only the sepulchre empty; and then, not until she went for the second time, saw two angels sitting in the sepulchre, and Jesus himself standing behind her. Again, Matthew and Mark know nothing of Luke's account (xxiv. 12) of Peter having gone to the sepulchre on hearing the statement of the women, and finding it empty, while according to John (xx. 2 ff.), the other disciples also went with him. These and some other subordinate discrepancies we do not bring prominently forward, as even without them it is sufficiently clear that in the Evangelical accounts of the appearances of Jesus after the resurrection, we have no evidence of such a character as to compel us to assume that the unheard-of facts to which they relate must really have taken place, rather than to suppose that the accounts themselves rest upon error.

But we have only entered upon these evangelical accounts of the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection in order to discover what means those persons to whom they are supposed to have been imparted, had and applied to convince themselves of the reality of these appearances. All the accounts endeavour to shew how the eleven, if not to the credit of their faith in believing, but at all events for the satisfaction of those who were afterwards to trust to their testimony, were anything but hasty in their belief. According to Luke, they considered the account given by the women of what they had seen, and the message of the angel, as empty talk (xxiv. 11); according to Mark, they gave no credit to the disciples who had gone into the country, who declared they had seen Jesus himself (xvi. 12); according to Matthew, some even were unbelievers on the occasion of the final appearance of Jesus in Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 17), at which we cannot be surprised if he appeared to them, as according to Mark he did to the disciples in the country, in a changed form. The means, however, by which at last the doubts of the disciples were satisfied and they brought to believe, were, according to Matthew and Mark, simply these. Jesus appeared to them themselves, approached them and spoke to them. In Luke, he finds it necessary to go much farther, and the most thorough sceptic whom he has to satisfy is John. There the two who went to Emmaus had just come in to the eleven, and been by them received with the intelligence of his resurrection and the appearance imparted to Peter, before they had time to tell of their own meeting with Jesus, when all at once Jesus stood in the midst of them. As they were still afraid, notwithstanding that information, and thought they had seen a spirit, Jesus shewed them his hands and his feet, calling upon them to touch him and convince themselves that he has bone and flesh, and consequently is not a spirit; and as they cannot believe for joy, he asked whether they had there any food, and imme-

diately partook before their eyes of a piece of fried fish and some honeycomb (xxiv. 36 ff.). These were proofs which in themselves might lead to the supposition of a natural return to life on the part of Jesus; but he had immediately before vanished from table before the eyes of the Emmaus disciples, and his sudden appearance on this occasion in the room in the midst of the disciples points to a supernatural entrance. But here, what Luke had only implied, John undoubtedly declares more definitely, when he says that Jesus came and stood in the middle of the room when the doors were shut (xx. 19, 20). On the first occasion, he shews his hands and his side, only, as it seems, to be looked at; on the second, he makes Thomas put his finger and hand in the marks of his wounds. To this, in the supplement to the Gospel, is further added the proof by eating the fried fish and bread (xxi. 5, ix. 12 ff.).

Now in this case, if the eating and the touching were historically true, it could not be doubtful that what appeared to the disciples was a human body, endowed with natural life and a natural body: if the shewing and feeling of the marks of the wounds were so, there could be as little doubt that the human being was the Jesus who died upon the cross: finally, if the entrance with closed doors were true, there could be no question that the natural corporeality and life of this human being was of a very peculiar, perfectly supernatural order. But then we have two things co-existing in absolute contradiction with each other. A body which can be touched, consequently has power of resistance, cannot penetrate through closed doors, *i.e.* cannot have at the same time that power of resistance; as, conversely, a body which penetrates through boards without opposition can have no bones, nor any organ by which to digest bread and fish. These are not conditions which can exist together in a real being, but such as only a fantastic imagination can combine together. The evangelical testimony in favour of the resur-

rection of Jesus endeavours to bring forward the most convincing of all proofs; in doing so, it breaks to pieces, and shews itself to be the mere result of a wish to give support to a dogmatical conception, which, so soon as the wish ceases to exist, collapses for want of any support at all.

47. THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS NOT A NATURAL REVIVAL.

We might, therefore, refuse to acknowledge in the resurrection of Jesus any miraculous objective occurrence for the following reasons. The evangelical evidence, on which the belief of that occurrence originally rested, is far from giving that certainty which it ought to give in order to make such a miracle credible. For, in the first place, it does not come from eye-witnesses; secondly, the different accounts do not agree; and thirdly, they give a description of the nature and movements of the subject after the resurrection, which contains in itself contradictory elements.

Inasmuch, then, as the ecclesiastical view of the matter, as regards the last point, admits only the possibility of a miracle, the essence of which involves characteristics which are, according to human notions, self-contradictory, an attempt is made to take another point of view, and to understand the evangelical accounts in such a manner that they shall not contain such contradictions. According to this, the Resurrection of Jesus takes the form of a natural occurrence, his condition after it is the same as it was before it. In the appearances after the resurrection, the accounts of which are given in the Evangelists, the advocates of this view keep exclusively to those features which seem to point to a perfectly natural corporeality; the marks of the wounds, the tangibility, the eating, which is here taken to be not merely a power of eating, but also as a want of sustenance. On the

other hand, they endeavour to set aside by an evasive explanation the opposite characteristics which point to something spiritual in the nature of Jesus after the resurrection. The fact of the disciples, as is sometimes stated, being afraid at his appearance (Luke xxvii. 37; John xxi. 12), is intelligible, they say, on the supposition that they really believed that he was dead, and thought consequently that what they then saw of him was his shade ascended from the world below. The travellers to Emmaus did not recognise him for some time. Mary Magdalene thought he was the gardener. The first of these is explained, sometimes by the disfigurement of his features by suffering, sometimes by supposing that he had not marked features; the latter, from the circumstance that, having risen from the grave unclothed from the sepulchre, he had borrowed clothes from the neighbouring gardener. While the doors were shut, he stood suddenly in the midst of his disciples. Even Schleiermacher considers it self-evident that the doors had been opened for him before. They see here, they say, a proof of the fact, that the body which Jesus brought from the grave was not a glorified one, but severely wounded and hurt, and gradually recovering. And this proof is the improvement shewn in his state of health between the morning of the resurrection, when he forbade Mary Magdalene to touch him (John xx. 17), and eight days later, when the healing of his wounds had advanced so far that he himself invited Thomas to do so. Again in the morning he stays quietly in the neighbourhood of his grave, in the afternoon he feels already strong enough for an expedition to Emmaus, three hours distant, and some days later undertakes even the journey to Galilee.

Even as to the resurrection itself, they say that the supernatural element exists, indeed, in the conception of the disciples and the Evangelists, but not in the thing itself. It is not to be wondered at, according to them, that excited women took the white linen clothes in the empty sepulchre, or strange

men in white dresses, for angels. No angel was wanted to roll away the stone, as it might have been done, either accidentally or intentionally, by men's hands.* Finally, it may be explained quite naturally, after the circumstances that had preceded, how Jesus should have come alive out of the sepulchre when the stone was taken away. Crucifixion, they maintain, even if the feet as well as the hands are supposed to have been nailed, occasions but very little loss of blood. It kills, therefore, only very slowly, by convulsions produced by the straining of the limbs, or by gradual starvation. So if Jesus, supposed indeed to be dead, had been taken down from the cross after about six hours, there is every probability of this supposed death having been only a death-like swoon, from which, after the descent from the cross, Jesus recovered again in the cool cavern, covered as he was with healing ointments and strongly scented spices. On this head it is usual to appeal to an account in Josephus, who says that on one occasion, when he was returning from a military reconnaissance on which he had been sent, he found several Jewish prisoners who had been crucified. He saw among them three acquaintances, whom he begged Titus to give to him. They were immediately taken down and carefully attended to: one was really saved, but the two others could not be recovered.† It cannot be said that this example is a very favourable one for the theory which it is brought forward to support. Out of three persons crucified, of whom we are ignorant how short or how long a time they had hung upon the cross, but who must still have given signs of life, as Josephus thought to save them, who received careful medical

* According to Schleiermacher, by the work-people of the owner of the garden, who knew nothing of the placing of Jesus in the sepulchre, but only wanted to move the stone to its place at a distance from the opening, where it had stood before, in order to give air to the newly-formed vault. Comp. my treatise, Schleiermacher and the Resurrection of Jesus, in Hilgenfeld's *Journal of Scientific Theology*, 1863, p. 386 ff.

† Josephus, *Vita*, 75.

treatment, two died and one recovered. From this it certainly does not become probable that one who was considered dead when taken down, and who had no medical treatment, should have returned to life again. No doubt what is thus said to be possible is possible; but no one would be justified in assuming that such a thing had really taken place unless he could bring forward certain proofs that Jesus subsequently shewed himself alive. But, according to the investigation of the question given above, this is by no means the case. The account of the Evangelists of the death of Jesus is clear, unanimous, and connected. Equally fragmentary, full of contradiction and obscurity, is all that they tell us of the opportunities of observing him which his adherents are supposed to have had of him after his resurrection. They are nothing but single individual appearances; he shews himself sometimes in one place, sometimes in another; sometimes in one way, sometimes in another: no one can tell whence he comes, or whither he goes, or where he stays. The whole thing gives the impression, not of a life objectively restored, connected in itself, but of a subjective conception in the minds of those who think they see him, of separate visions, which may indeed in the first instance have appeared, but were certainly at a later period coloured up and exaggerated in various ways.

It was consequently an unnecessary effort on the part of the natural interpretation to endeavour to remove the miraculous element out of the evangelical accounts of the resurrection of Jesus. The only object can be to remove it from the actual course of events. But this real course the Evangelists do not give us; they only give us their own conception of it, and we have no difficulty in admitting the miraculous element in this. So likewise we may spare ourselves the trouble of pointing out in detail the unnatural element in the explanations which are thus given to the words of the Evangelists. It is surely clear that when a narrator says

twice in the same words, "Jesus came and stood in the midst of them when the doors were shut," it is by no means self-evident that they had been opened for him beforehand; that if the corporeality of Jesus was natural, he could not vanish from table in the presence of the two disciples at Emmaus; that the supposed steps in the progress of his recovery are only imagined, because nothing can be more opposed to the unmistakable conception of all the narrators than what points to suffering, or in general to any human necessities or needs. Besides which, it is quite evident that this view of the resurrection of Jesus, apart from the difficulties in which it is involved, does not even solve the problem which is here under consideration—the origin, that is, of the Christian Church by faith in the miraculous resurrection of the Messiah. It is impossible that a being who had stolen half-dead out of the sepulchre, who crept about weak and ill, wanting medical treatment, who required bandaging, strengthening and indulgence, and who still at last yielded to his sufferings, could have given to the disciples the impression that he was a Conqueror over death and the grave, the Prince of Life, an impression which lay at the bottom of their future ministry. Such a resuscitation could only have weakened the impression which he had made upon them in life and in death, at the most could only have given it an elegiac voice, but could by no possibility have changed their sorrow into enthusiasm, have elevated their reverence into worship.

48. THE APPEARANCE OF CHRIST TO THE APOSTLE PAUL.

In what was said above, after stating what we learn from the Apostle Paul, speaking in the main, presumably, on the authority of eye-witnesses, about the appearance of Jesus after his resurrection, we turned to the narratives of the Evangelists upon the same subject, in order to discover more

accurately what was not to be gathered from the short notices of the Apostle, upon what the conviction of these eye-witnesses may have rested that they had really seen Jesus after he had risen again. But we did not find what we sought for. Independent of the fact of which we were already aware, that we had no certainty in the case of any one of the Evangelists that he tells what he had learnt from either the oral statements or the notes of eye-witnesses, we may say that they do indeed go more into detail than Paul, but their accounts stand in the first place in direct contradiction with each other, and in the next place what they tell us is so inconsistent with itself that we cannot trust it, but find ourselves referred back to the Apostle Paul. If we look more closely at what he says, we see that we turned away from his statements with so little satisfaction from them, because we did not allow the Apostle to speak out. He speaks, indeed, not merely of the appearances of Christ which Cephas and James, the Twelve, and the five hundred brethren saw, but—"and last of all," he adds, "he was seen of me too as of one born out of due time" (1 Cor. xv. 8). With regard to the appearance which he witnessed, he uses the same expression as with regard to the others; he places it in the same category with them, only in the last place, as he names himself the last of the Apostles, but in exactly the same rank with the others. Thus much, therefore, Paul knew or supposed—that the appearances which the elder disciples had seen soon after the resurrection of Jesus had been of the same kind as that which had been, only later, vouchsafed to himself. Of what sort, then, was this?*

It is well known that we have of it, in the Acts of the

* Compare, on this point, beside Baur's explanations in his "Apostle Paul and the Christianity of the Three First Centuries," and Zeller's Essay on the Acts, C. Holsten, "Appearance of Christ to the Apostle Paul," in Hilgenfeld's Journal of Scientific Theology, 1861, iii. 224—284; H. Lang, Religious Characters, i. 11 ff.

Apostles, a detailed, indeed a threefold account (ix. 1—30, xxii. 1—21, xxvi. 4—23), which certainly tells of an external, sensible appearance, of a light from heaven, which threw Paul to the ground and blinded him for some days, a voice from heaven which spoke to him intelligible words, and was heard by those who accompanied him. But there is no proof here of the objective reality of the appearance like that which, according to the third and fourth Evangelists, Jesus is said to have vouchsafed to the elder disciples, when he allowed himself to be touched by them, and partook of food before their eyes. Apart from the blindness and its removal by Ananias, as also the phenomena seen by the attendants, we might look upon all as a vision which Paul attributed indeed to an external cause, but which nevertheless took place in his own mind. That we are not bound to the individual features of the account in the Acts, is shewn by comparing with it the substance of the statement twice repeated in the language of Paul himself; for there we find that the author's own account is not accurate, that he attributed no importance to a few variations more or less. Not only is it said, as has been already remarked in passing, that on one occasion the attendants stood dumb-founded, on another that they fell with Paul to the ground; that on one occasion they heard the voice but saw no one, on another that they saw the light but did not hear the voice of him who spoke with Paul; but also the speech of Jesus himself, in the third repetition, gets the well-known addition about "kicking against the pricks;" to say nothing of the fact that the appointment to the apostleship of the Gentiles, which, according to the two earlier accounts, was made partly by Ananias, partly on the occasion of a subsequent vision in the Temple at Jerusalem, is in this last account incorporated in the speech of Jesus on the occasion of the first appearance. There is no occasion to derive the three accounts of this occurrence in the Acts from different sources, and even in this case one

must suppose that the author must have remarked and reconciled the discrepancies: that he did not do so, or rather that, without following his own earlier narrative, he repeated it in an arbitrary form, proves to us how careless the New Testament writers are about details of that kind, important as they are to one who strives after strict historical accuracy.

But even if the narrator in the Acts had gone more accurately to work, still he would not be an eye-witness, scarcely even a writer who took the history from the narrative of an eye-witness. Even if we consider the person who in different places of the Acts comprehends himself and the Apostle Paul under the word "we" or "us" to have been the composer of the whole work, that person was not, on the occasion of the occurrence before Damascus, as yet in the company of the Apostle. Into this he did not enter until much later, in the Troad, on the Apostle's second missionary journey (Acts xvi. 10). But that hypothesis with regard to the author of the Acts of the Apostles, is, moreover, as we have seen above, erroneous. He only worked up into different passages of his composition the memoranda of a temporary companion of the Apostle about the journeys performed in his company, and we are therefore not justified in considering the narrator in these passages and sections in which the "we" is wanting as an eye-witness. Now among these is found the very section in which appear the two accounts of his conversion which Paul gives first to the Jewish people in Jerusalem, secondly to Agrippa and Festus in Cæsarea. The last occasion on which the "we" was found was xxi. 18, that of the visit of Paul to James, and it does not appear again until xxvii. 1, when the subject is the Apostle's embarkation for Italy. Nothing, therefore, compels us externally to assume that we have in the report of these speeches the account of any one who had been a party to the hearing of them, and, in them, Paul's own narrative of the occurrences that took place on his conversion. Moreover, the history in its internal cha-

racter, with its shining light and falling down, its miraculous blinding and healing, its dreams and visions dovetailing into each other, is so completely in the fashion of the tales of appearances and miracles current among the Jews and the original Christians, and so especially resembles the manner in which the author of the Acts of the Apostles and the third Gospel loves to arrange scenes of this kind (comp. *e.g.* the history of Cornelius and Peter, Acts x. 11; of Zachariah and the angel, Luke i. 8 ff.), that we look upon this appearance of Christ to Paul as exactly on the same footing as those witnessed by the earlier disciples. That is, we find ourselves in this case also thrown back from evidence of the third rank upon that of the Apostle, which moreover is not in this instance evidence of the second but of the first rank.

Now in this instance we have to complain of the same thing as in others, that the Apostle, even in reference to the first appearance imparted to him, expresses himself so very briefly. In the passage already quoted (1 Cor. xv. 8), all that he says of himself is, that the risen Christ had appeared, or been made visible to him. In another passage he asks, "Did I not see Jesus Christ, our Lord?" (1 Cor. ix. 1), where, without doubt, he means the same appearance. In that passage, lastly, in which he enters more fully than elsewhere upon the description of all that he had done and that had happened to him, he only says that it had pleased God (Gal. i. 13—17) to reveal his Son in him, that he might preach him among the heathen. Taking these different expressions together, we have on the one hand the conviction of the Apostle that he had seen Jesus, and we may add thus much from the narrative in the Acts, that he thought he had heard him, heard words proceeding from his lips. Paul thought that on other occasions also it had been vouchsafed to him to hear words of this kind from the upper regions. It cannot be the appearance we are now speaking of, but must have been another subsequently, when in the second Epistle to

the Corinthians (xii. 1 ff.) he speaks of a man who fourteen years before was caught up into the third heaven, into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words which it was not lawful for a man to utter. But when he adds, "whether in the body he cannot tell, or whether out of the body he cannot tell, God knoweth," we see that he was not without consciousness of the difficulty of establishing the real nature of the fact in appearances of this kind. And when, on the other hand, in the passage of the Epistle to the Galatians, he describes what he had seen and done as the effect of revelation of God in him, he lays the main stress on the internal element, conceives of the seeing and hearing of Christ as accompanied by the rising up within his mind of the true knowledge of him as the Son of God. It is certain that in doing so he considered the ascended Christ as really and externally present, the appearance as in the full sense an objective one: but he is far from saying anything to prevent us (as certain features in the narrative of the Acts might do, if we were obliged to take them in the strictly historical sense) from being of a different opinion, and considering the appearance as one merely subjective, as a fact of the inward life of his soul.

The Apostle himself tells us that certain ecstatic states of mind were not of rare occurrence with him. "If it were expedient for him to glory," he writes to the Christians in Corinth (2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.), he could boast of a superabundance of visions and revelations with which he had been favoured; among which he then mentions especially the case just spoken of, about the catching up into the third heaven. "But that lest he should be exalted above measure, there had been given to him a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet him." On reading these words, attacks of convulsion, perhaps of epilepsy, naturally occur to the mind, and the probability of them is strengthened by what he says elsewhere of the weakness of his body, the unsightliness of his outward appearance (2 Cor. x. 10; Galat. iv. 13),

The notion of a nervous constitution is suggested by the speaking with tongues, in which, as he says (1 Cor. xiv. 18), he surpassed all the members of the Corinthian Church; for it was an ecstatic sort of speaking, which no one could understand without an interpreter. Paul also ascribes to a revelation the impulse which he felt to take the journey to Jerusalem, which had for its object his communicating with the other Apostles (Gal. ii. 2); and here we may see quite clearly, what Baur has already drawn attention to, how these supposed supernatural mental revelations occurred in him. Besides the revelation, he further brings forward a very rational ground for having undertaken the journey with Barnabas, namely, in order not to run the danger of all his previous apostolical labour being in vain. There was just at that time an awkward complication. The great success of the Apostle Paul among the heathen had begun to draw upon him the notice of the primal Church in Jerusalem. Suspicion was aroused in this metropolis of Jewish Christianity by the fact that in Antioch a centre of Heathen Christianity was set up in opposition to it. Members of the metropolitan Church came to Antioch, where Paul was labouring, and appealing, as it would appear, to the Apostles who stood at the head of that Church, demanded that the Heathen, in order to be adopted into participation in the salvation of the Messiah, should first be compelled to subject themselves to the law of Moses, and especially to circumcision. Paul could not conscientiously yield to such a demand: if the original Apostles really persevered in it, the division became inevitable which threatened to destroy the effects of the work to which he had devoted his life. We may imagine how deeply his mind was moved by this circumstance—how it haunted him day and night; and considering the character of his mind, we cannot be surprised that there resulted from it at last a revelation, an imaginary command of Christ revealing himself to him in a dream or waking moment.

Let us now transport ourselves back into the period before his conversion, and think of the excitement into which he, the zealot for the hereditary institutions of Judaism (Gal. i. 14), must have been brought by the threatening progress of the growing Christianity. He saw at that time what he held most dear and most holy endangered; a spiritual tendency appeared to be spreading unchecked, making of secondary consideration precisely that which was to him the most important thing of all, the strict observance of all Jewish laws and customs, and which opposed in the most hostile manner that party especially to which he had attached himself with all the fiery zeal of his nature. Now we might indeed suppose that out of such mental emotions, a visionary Moses or Elias might at last have started, rather than an appearance of Christ; but only when the other side of the question is left out of consideration. The result shewed that the satisfaction which Paul thought to find in his Pharisaic zeal for righteousness was not of a tranquillising character. This was evident, even at that time, from the passionate disquietude, the zealous precipitancy of his conduct. On the different occasions on which he came in contact with the new believers in the Messiah, when first, in the character, as we must suppose, of a disputatious dialectician as he was, he argued with them (comp. Acts ix. 29), then entered their assemblies, haled them away prisoners, and helped to bring them to trial, he could not fail to feel himself on a disadvantageous footing with them in two respects. The fact on which they relied, on which they built the whole of their faith as differing from their hereditary Judaism, was the resurrection of Jesus. Had he been a Sadducee, it would have been easy for him to combat this asserted fact, for the Sadducees recognised no resurrection whatever (Acts. xxiii. 7). But Paul was a Pharisee, believed therefore in the resurrection, not indeed to happen until the end of time; but that in a particular case, the case of a holy man, it might have happened exceptionally even earlier—this supposition from the

point of view of Jewish notions at that time created no difficulty. He must therefore, in the case of Jesus, have relied principally upon the fact, that it could not be assumed to have happened to him, because he was not a holy man, but, on the contrary, a false teacher, an impostor. But, in the presence of the believers in Jesus, this must have become every day more doubtful to him. They considered it not only publicly honourable to be as convinced of his resurrection as they were of their own life, but they shewed also a state of mind, a quiet peace, a tranquil cheerfulness, even under suffering, which put to shame the restless and joyless zeal of their persecutor. Could *he* have been a false teacher who had adherents such as these; could that have been a mendacious pretence which gave such rest and security? On the one hand, he saw the new sect, in spite of all persecutions, nay, in consequence of them, extending their influence wider and wider around them; on the other, as their persecutor, he felt that inward tranquillity growing less and less which he could observe in so many ways in the persecuted. We cannot therefore be surprised if in hours of despondency and inward unhappiness he put to himself the question: "Who, after all, is right, thou or the crucified Galilean, about whom these men are so enthusiastic?" And when he had once got as far as this, the result, with his bodily and mental characteristics, naturally followed in an ecstasy in which the very same Christ, whom up to this time he had so passionately persecuted, appeared to him in all the glory of which his adherents spoke so much, shewed him the perversity and folly of his conduct, and called him to come over to his service.

49. REVIEW OF THE ORIGIN OF THE BELIEF IN THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

If then we are right in supposing that this appearance of Christ which occasioned the conversion of the Apostle Paul

from Pharisaic Judaism to the newly-founded Church of the Messiah was of this character, and if those appearances which in the older disciples accompanied the rise of the faith in Jesus as the risen Messiah were of essentially the same kind as in the other case—then were these latter solely internal states of mind, which might indeed present themselves to the subjects of them as external sensible perceptions, but are to be considered by us only as results of mental excitement—as visions.

The causes which produced these appearances, the conditions which made them possible, were in both cases of the same sort. The excitement occasioned in the mind of the later Apostle by the threatening progress of Christianity and his zeal in the persecution of its adherents, was produced, conversely, in the older Apostles by the persecution that broke out on the part of the Jews against Jesus and his adherents. The impression received by Paul from the first Christian Church, from their cheerfulness in faith and suffering, arose in the case of the earlier disciples from their recollection of the personality of Jesus himself, and their vivid conviction that he was the Messiah.

The Jewish conceptions of the Messiah, though different in different persons, agreed nevertheless in this, that the Messiah, after the opening of his kingdom, would continue to reign over his followers for a period far exceeding the natural duration of human life. According to Luke i. 33 (comp. John xii. 34), his dominion was to have, absolutely, no end, as we might read in Ps. cx. 4; Isaiah ix. 7; Dan vii. 14, 27; elsewhere we find sometimes a duration of a thousand years (Rev. xx. 4), sometimes of four hundred,* sometimes even a shorter dominion of the Messiah on earth is supposed.† If he died at last, this death was to happen to

* 4 Ezra v. 29 ff.; comp. on this, Volkmar, Introduction to the Apocrypha, ii. 61 ff.

† Gfrörer, The Century of Salvation, ii. 252 ff.

all life on earth for the purpose of bringing about the change into the super-terrestrial state;* in no case could he die until he had finished his work and executed all that was expected of him; in no case as one submitting to superior power, as a condemned criminal. Both had occurred to Jesus; his ministry as the Messiah had been broken off by the violence practised against him by the Jews, even before it had fully begun. Interrupted it had been, but even this only apparently; the people to whom he had been sent had shewn themselves unworthy to keep him and to partake of the blessings which he had wished to bring them. Therefore the Heavens at length had taken him up until the people should become worthy of his being sent again by God, that the times of restitution long since promised to the true Israel may come in (Acts iii. 20 ff.). The element of the premature and violent death could only be adopted into the Jewish conception of the Messiah on one condition, a condition, however, not unacceptable. That condition was the viewing of the death of the Messiah, not as a descent of his soul into the kingdom of Shadows, but as an exaltation to God, as an entrance into the glory of the Messiah (Luke xxiv. 25 ff.), with the prospect in reserve of a future return in that glory.

If the Old Testament was examined with this view, this passing of the Messiah through death and the grave to a new and higher life could as easily be found there, as, in so many places, treating of quite different persons and things, the Messiah and circumstances relating to him were found. Did then, it might be said, and in fact was said, David praise God on his own account (Ps. xvi. 9 ff.), for not leaving his soul in hell, and not suffering his flesh to see corruption—David, who had died as other men, and whose body had seen corruption? Or was it not rather his great successor, the Messiah, that is, Jesus, to whom those words applied as a pro-

* 4 Ezra, *ibid.*

phcey (Acts ii. 25 ff.)? Had not, further, Isaiah prophesied of the servant of Jehovah, that he shall be cut off out of the land of the living, and make his grave with the wicked, but that when he has made his soul a sin-offering, he will live long, and divide his spoil with the strong? (Isaiah liii. 8—12).

In connection with these words, the disciples might remember many of Jesus himself, in which were involved on the one hand allusions to the passion and death that awaited him, on the other hand to the victory of his cause, which was not to be defeated thereby, and these words, perhaps, had been placed in connection with passages of this kind out of the Old Testament. Luke, xxiv. 25 ff., xxxii. 44 ff., represents it as having been one of the principal things that Jesus did after his resurrection, to open the Scriptures before the disciples, and point out to them how his Passion, Death, and Resurrection were predicted in them. But we have no trace of this, that after the final departure of Jesus it was a renewed search into the Scriptures which served to revive the faith of his disciples.

The case, then, immediately after the decease of Jesus, between the Jews of the ancient faith and his adherents stood as follows. The former said, "Your Jesus cannot have been the Messiah, because the Messiah is to continue for ever, or not to die until after a long period of dominion as the Messiah, at the same time as all other earthly life; but your Jesus has died before the time by a disgraceful death, without having done anything expected of the Messiah." On the other hand, the latter said, "As Jesus, our Messiah, died so early, the prophecies which promise to the Messiah that he shall endure for ever can only have meant that his death shall not be a continuance in hell, but a transmigration into a higher life with God, from whence he will return to earth at his own time, in order to bring to a conclusion his work that was interrupted through your guilt."

Now if the eminent men of the Old Testament to whom a

similar ascension to God had been vouchsafed, an Enoch and Elijah (Moses also, according to later Jewish legends, of which below), had ascended thither without the intervention of death, they must have taken their bodies with them unchanged. This seems to be an essential difference, but it is not so. The mortal bodies of an Enoch or Elijah could not have entered in their natural state into the heavenly world of spirits, but God must have changed them first. What in these cases he did with the living bodies, in the case of Jesus he did with the dead body, anticipating at the same time, in him, the future resurrection of the dead. The distinction was only the same as the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. xvi. 51 ff.) assumed was to exist between those who were to live until Christ's second coming and those who had died before. The former were to be changed, the latter awakened; *i.e.* the bodies of the former were to attain the condition requisite for the new life in the kingdom of Christ, without the intervention of death, while in the case of the latter, the dead bodies would be at the same time re-awakened and changed. But that such a double miracle, exceeding far what had occurred in the case of Enoch and Elijah, occurred also in that of Jesus, could only be credible to one who saw in him a prophet superior to them, *i.e.* to one who, notwithstanding his death, was persuaded that he was the Messiah: this conviction was the first to which the disciples had to attain in the days of their humiliation after his crucifixion. When they had done so, it became a matter of course that his soul could not be confined powerless in hell, but must have ascended up to God in heaven; and when they reflected upon the mode in which this ascension might have taken place, they came, from the Jewish point of view, to which the soul without the body was a mere shadow, to the conception of a restoration of his body to life, *i.e.* of the resurrection.

As there was no necessity for this conception to be even accurately defined, the possibility was readily assumed that

the ascended Messiah might shew himself in his new glory to his followers. If he were once conceived as being with God in the position of an Angel, he must have the power of appearing as an Angel, otherwise such an intimation of his existence need not be even a visible appearance. On the occasion of that vouchsafed to Paul, there were, according to the description in the Acts, two things together: there was a shining light, which was considered as the veil of the ascended Christ, and an audible voice from heaven. The latter reminds us of the audible oracle of the later Jewish faith, the so-called "daughter of the voice" (*bath kol*) which we hear of in the Rabbinic writings, and which, as may be seen from John (xii. 29), consisted in a natural sound, accidentally arising, as a sudden clap of thunder and the like, being considered as an omen, and a definite meaning being given to it, according to the circumstances or the temper of men's minds, with the existence of which it coincided. If it had been Paul himself who told us of a light which suddenly shone around him, and of a voice which he heard from out the splendour (otherwise than merely symbolically, as 2 Cor. iv. 6), we should have no hesitation in thinking of a flash of lightning and a clap of thunder, which, coinciding with the inward struggles in his mind, was considered by the Apostle as the appearance and angry voice of the Christ whom he persecuted; but as it is only the Acts of the Apostles which gives the account, we cannot, considering the later origin, and in many respects unhistorical character, of this writing, determine whether these features of the description belong or not only to legend or poetic fiction.

Thus also some of the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection, taken by themselves, are by no means incapable of explanation as perfectly natural occurrences. According to Luke, on the second day after the crucifixion, two disciples, who were going from Jerusalem into the country, met with a person unknown, who in inspired words opened their

understandings with regard to the death of the Messiah, and just at the moment when he separated from them in the dusk, they thought they recognised him as their own Jesus: in the supplementary chapter to the fourth Gospel, certain disciples, being in the ship in the twilight of the early morning, on the sea of Galilee, met an unknown person on the shore, who gave them some advice on the subject of throwing out their net: in consequence of the surprisingly fortunate result, they considered him to be "the Lord," without one of them having had the confidence to ask him whether he was really so. In these cases, taking the narratives by themselves, and supposing them in the main historical, we might admit that the excitement of the disciples after the sudden death of Jesus, their power of imagination incessantly busy with the recalling of his figure, readily shewed them in the first unknown person who met them in ambiguous circumstances and made a particular impression on them, an appearance of the Master who had been taken from them. And here an appeal might be made to historical examples of similar delusions having happened under similar circumstances. I quote one of these from the history of my own home. Duke Ulrich of Wurtemberg was, not indeed killed by the Swabian league, but only banished from his country; this was occupied by the Austrians, and secured against his return. "But as the Duke," says an excellent historian,* "still numbered many adherents in the country, whose hearts "and minds he occupied waking and dreaming, and the command not even to speak of him invested his person in a "mysterious obscurity, the power of imagination became naturally more inventive. Stones and animals were represented "as speaking of him. There were also people who professed "to have seen their former master (here and there in the "country), or even to have had him in disguise under their "roof. 'The heart thinks, the hour brings.'"

* L. F. Heyd, Ulrich, Duke of Wurtemberg, ii. 169 ff.

It is not to be supposed that the duke, in his cautious and suspicious state of mind, would have really thus travelled about unprotected among his enemies. We must therefore consider these tales of his haunting the country like a spectre solely as the results of the excited imagination, and consequently of legend, for which, as the acute historian does not forget to remind us, circumstances like those described are a particularly favourable soil. The hostess at Münchingen, of whom he tells, may have really taken a foreign guest who lodged with her for the duke; so, sooner or later, may the collier at Urach the unknown person to whom he shewed the way through the wood; and these stories, told at greater length, might have given occasion for the invention of others in which there was nothing real whatever.

Similar delusions may also in the case before us have been current at the same time; but it is scarcely likely that the first appearances of Jesus, which individuals thought they had seen, were of this kind. As soon as ever the notion that Jesus had been seen restored to life had once taken root, mistakes of that kind might be made; but originally, as the question was not about an exile, but about one who was dead, the faith could not have arisen in this way. When Paul says that he appeared after his resurrection to Cephas first, the possibility is not excluded, as was above remarked, of certain women having supposed that they had already seen him. The expression of Mark (xvi. 9), "He appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had driven seven devils," admits of much suspicion. Not only John (xx. 14 ff.), but also Matthew, agrees with Mark, that it was this woman who first saw such an appearance, only that Matthew (xxviii. 1, 9 ff.) associates with her the other Mary, and the notice of the seven devils driven out of her was ready to hand for Mark from Luke (viii. 2). In a woman of such a constitution of body and mind, it was no great step from inward excitement to ocular vision. But we have seen in the example

of the Apostle Paul that even in men of that period, and educated as they were, mental conditions like these were not unheard of. As regards Peter, we may refer those who in the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles see a real history, unusual indeed but still natural, to the occurrence before the baptism of the Roman officer Cornelius, as a proof of a visionary disposition in the Apostle. Even in the brightness of the noon, during the time that he was praying on the house-top, he fell into a trance, in which he thought he saw the well-known appearance of a sheet coming from heaven with all kinds of animals, and that he heard a voice from heaven. This history indeed we lay to the account of the legends of the Church, or the pragmatism of the author of the Acts, but think we may assume in the days after the death of Jesus, in the narrower circle of his adherents, a common tone, an elevation of mental and nervous life, which over-rode the particular disposition of the individual. Of James,* the tradition says in the Gospel of the Hebrews that Christ appeared to him after the resurrection, when he had fasted several days; this circumstance also, assumed to be historical, would make a vision or hallucination all the more intelligible.

Luke, speaking of the disciples going to Emmaus, says that when the Unknown, following their invitation, had placed himself at table with them, he took bread, uttered the prayer, then broke it and gave it to them. Then, he says, "on the breaking of the bread," they recognised him as the Lord (xxiv. 30 ff., 35). The division of bread and fish by an unknown person, in whom the disciples saw the risen Jesus, is brought forward in a similarly significant manner in the supplementary chapter also to the Gospel of John (xxi. 13). Let us remember, now, that by the expression, "breaking of bread," the supper was accustomed to be described (Acts ii. 42, 46, xx. 7; 1 Cor. x. 16), and that this meal, the material

* Hieron. De vir. ill. 2.

representation of the last, and many others besides in which Jesus had, in the capacity of host, shared the bread among them, formed in the most ancient times, by frequent, probably daily, repetition, a powerful consolation and bond of union of the little band of the early Church. If we remember this, it is obvious to conjecture that it may have been principally the exalted tone of mind which prevailed at this meal, which in particular cases elevated the memory of the Departed into an imaginary appearance even before larger assemblies.

50. TIME AND PLACE OF THE APOSTOLIC VISIONS OF CHRIST.

If we ask when and where the disciples of Jesus saw these apparitions, the most ancient witness, the Apostle Paul, gives us, as we have already mentioned, little or no assistance towards arriving at a result. The place he does not define at all, the time only apparently. He says (1 Cor. xv. 3—8) that he had heard as a tradition that Christ had died, and been buried, and that on the third day he had risen again according to the Scriptures, and that he had appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve, &c. Paul therefore says, indeed, that Jesus arose on the third day; but that it was on the same third day that he appeared after his resurrection to Cephas or any one else, he does not say. Moreover, he mentions this appearance to Cephas immediately indeed after the statement of the resurrection, but in like manner he mentions the appearance which he himself had seen immediately after the appearance of Jesus to the Apostles collectively. But the appearance to himself could not, in any case, have taken place until several years after the death and resurrection of Jesus. Thus we do not know what length of time we must suppose to have occurred between the different appearances, or, consequently, between the first of them and the resurrection on the third day.

On the other hand, the authorities of the third rank, the Evangelists, represent all, or at all events a part of, the appearances of Jesus after the resurrection as occurring on the very day of the resurrection. According to John, he appears to Mary Magdalene on the morning of the resurrection close to the grave—then in the evening to the assembled disciples; according to Luke, his first appearance is on the same day, to the two going to Emmaus, then to the eleven and the others; and the same assumption lies at the bottom of the brief and confused account of Mark. In Matthew he does not indeed shew himself to the eleven until later, in Galilee, but to the women on the morning of the resurrection on their return to the city from the sepulchre which they had found empty. And now it may be said, how did it happen that in the most ancient times of Christianity, the third day after the death of Jesus was set down as the day of the resurrection, if it was not on this day that the first appearances of him, after his resurrection, took place? How can we explain the fact that so early as the time of the Apostle Paul and the composition of the Revelation of John, the day after the Sabbath appears as the day of the Lord, the Christian weekly holiday (1 Cor. xvi. 2; Rev. i. 7), if it was not on this day that the great fact of the restoration of their Messiah to life was made known to the disciples?

If we look upon the resurrection of Jesus as a miracle, it might take place as well on one day as another; a natural restoration to life must occur on some day soon after death, or it could not occur at all; on the other hand, the psychological revolution from which *we* suppose the visions of Apostles to have proceeded, appears to require a longer interval for its development. More than one day, it would seem, should intervene before the disciples could recover from their terror at the unlooked-for result, before they could assemble together again after their first dispersion. Supposing, in particular, that it was from renewed and profounder study

of the sacred writings of the Old Testament that the certainty arose that their Jesus, in spite of suffering and death, had been the Messiah, that his suffering and death had been for him only the passage to the glory of the Messiah, for this also a longer time was requisite. It appears, therefore, if it is true that on the very first day after the death of Jesus appearances of his took place, not to be conceivable that these appearances were merely subjective visions of the disciples; and our view of the origin of the belief in the resurrection of Jesus appears to fall to pieces upon the impossibility of making that origin conceivable on the third day.

In like manner, the statement of the locality of these appearances in the Gospels seems to lead to a result unfavourable to our point of view. On the morning after the Sabbath, on the evening of the third day before which morning the crucified Jesus had been buried, the disciples, according to the accounts of the Evangelists, were still at Jerusalem, and here, according to all of them, even Matthew not excepted, the first appearances of their risen Lord occurred. Jesus therefore appeared to his disciples in the same place in which his body had been laid in the grave. Even this circumstance appears only to put us into a difficulty, while for the two other possible views of the resurrection of Jesus, it is inconceivable. For supposing Jesus to have been recalled into life by a miracle, or awakened naturally from an apparent death,—in neither case would there be a body in the grave, by pointing to which the proposition maintained by the disciples that he had risen could be contradicted. When in the very city before the gates of which the body of Jesus lay in a sepulchre well known and easy to be found, not forty-eight hours after it had been buried there, his disciples came forward, maintaining that he had risen, that he had come alive out of the sepulchre, how is it conceivable that the Jews should not have run straight to this sepulchre, fetched the corpse away, and by the public exhibition of it have con-

victed the audacious assertion of falsehood? Or rather, how could the disciples come to make this assertion, when they could examine the neighbouring cavern in order to convince themselves of its groundlessness?

But, in the first place, the Evangelists do indeed tell us that Jesus appeared to his followers so soon as the second morning after his interment; but not one says that they encountered the unbelieving Jews with the announcement of his resurrection. On the contrary, according to all the accounts, they kept quiet from the first, and Luke, in the Acts, represents the Apostles as not coming forward to preach of the resurrection of Christ until Pentecost, seven weeks, consequently, after that third day. In addition to this, there is the consideration that the interment of Jesus in the stone sepulchre of Joseph, is anything but historically corroborated, as has been already intimated, and shall be hereafter more accurately discussed. But if Jesus was, as is probable, buried with other condemned criminals in a dishonourable place, his disciples had not from the first the tempting opportunity of looking for his body. And if some time elapsed before they came forward proclaiming his resurrection, it must have been more difficult for their opponents also to produce his corpse in a condition still to be recognised or affording any proof. Moreover, when we remember the horror for dead bodies felt by the Jews, it was far from being so obvious a thing to do as we may at this day imagine.

Now as regards the shortness of the time for the development of a state of mind among the disciples from which those visions could proceed, this difficulty also is not insuperable. A purely logical method, by the intervention of clear thoughts, was not yet possible; and if it was not, and the reaction took place in the secret depths of the minds of the Apostles, then it was a violent burst, a flash of lightning, in which the sultriness of the overloaded feelings relieved itself. Such a burst does not wait until all is first arranged in the

course of thought; on the contrary, it assumes, by the power of imagination, all that reflection endeavours afterwards to clear up; it takes for granted at one stroke what the understanding afterwards works up. Thus our notion of the resurrection of Jesus would be far from being quashed, even if it were established that, in fact, so soon as the third day after his death the conviction of it had arisen among the disciples.

Meanwhile, there are many points in the New Testament accounts themselves which throw a doubt upon this statement. Let us take that which was last touched upon: Why should the disciples, if they were convinced of the resurrection of their Christ so soon as the third day, have waited till the fiftieth before they allowed anything about it to come before the public in general? The Acts of the Apostles says, because they were compelled to wait for the Holy Spirit, which was not to be poured out upon them until the day of Pentecost; and we know, on our own point of view, that the choice of this day especially for the communication of the Spirit was decided by the antitypical relation in which the most ancient Christian view placed the first preaching of the Gospel to the Lawgiving on Sinai*—that, therefore, this choice of time has no historical, but only a dogmatical foundation. But it is another question whether in this statement the recollection may not be involved, that the preaching of the resurrection of Jesus was deferred until a later period, as well as the origination of the belief in this resurrection until one of longer duration than three days.

But all the Evangelists, even Matthew, agree in representing Jesus, after his resurrection, as appearing on the third day in or near Jerusalem. Even Matthew—but how? First he describes the angel at the grave as announcing to the women the resurrection of Jesus, with directions to commu-

* Comp. Gfrörer, *the Century of Salvation*, ii, 390 ff.

nicate the intelligence quickly to the disciples, meanwhile that Jesus will go before them to Galilee, where they are to see him. Nor are the disciples only to see their risen Lord in Galilee, but "you," says the angel, "even you women will see him there, in Galilee." When, then, immediately after, when the women were running from the sepulchre to the city, Jesus himself meets them on the road, this is certainly exceedingly strange. If they saw Jesus here, they did not see him first, as the angel had predicted, in Galilee. And what occasion could Jesus have to depart so quickly from the plan which he had just before caused to be announced by the angel? The women were intending to give their message to the disciples, and for themselves they were already convinced, for they went from the sepulchre, as Matthew says, with fear, naturally, but also with great joy. Or had Jesus something more to say to them which the angel had forgotten? On the contrary, he repeats exactly the same thing which the angel had already said to them: that the disciples should journey to Galilee; there they will see him. Anything so perfectly superfluous as this first appearance of Christ in Matthew not only never happened, but in this connection was never told; it is a later interpolation, not into our text of Matthew, but into the account which the first Evangelist placed at the foundation of his history of the resurrection, but into which he here introduced a feature absolutely irreconcilable with it. If we suppose this appearance removed, his narrative is perfectly consistent with itself. Near Jerusalem, at the sepulchre, and on the morning of the resurrection, only the angel appears with the preliminary announcement, and the direction to go to Galilee; Jesus himself appears, according to agreement, in Galilee, and not before, after the disciples with the women had finished the journey there. If, according to this, Galilee is the theatre for the appearance of the risen Jesus, if this appearance is thus brought down to a somewhat later period

than the third day, as it is impossible that the disciples should have reached the hill country of Galilee on the same day on the morning of which they had received the instruction to set off to go there, this view, which is at the bottom of Matthew's account, is, as has been mentioned already, directly opposed to the description in Luke and John, where Jerusalem and the neighbourhood is the peculiar and, if we set aside the supplementary chapter in John, the only theatre of the announcements made by the risen Christ, which might thus be supposed to begin on the very day of the resurrection. This last conception is irreconcilable with the first, which lies at the bottom of the narrative in Matthew. But still the author of the first Gospel has so far yielded to it that he has represented Jesus as having appeared, not indeed to the disciples, for then the journey to Galilee would have been quite aimless, but to the women while still in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.

If, of these opposite notions with regard to the locality of these appearances, that of Luke and John appears to be the latest, from the fact that in Matthew one feature out of it is laid upon the other, the statement in Matthew, this feature apart, has internal historical probability on its side. It was indeed perfectly open to Jesus, if miraculously restored to life, to shew himself to his followers at Jerusalem as well as in Galilee, and if he had come to life again in a natural manner, possibly wounds and weakness might have kept him at first in Jerusalem. But the disciples, with whom on our point of view we have alone to do, had evidently after the blow which had fallen upon their Master in the metropolis, every reason for returning as soon as possible to their home in Galilee. They could not know how far the hierarchical party would go, whether they might not, being encouraged by their success against their Master, seize also upon his most notorious adherents. In Jerusalem, where they were strangers, they stood without protection in the presence of such dangers.

In Galilee they were at home, secured by their connection both with relatives and countrymen, and the hierarchical party were far from being as powerful as in the capital. There are unmistakeable traces in favour of this view in a statement in the Gospels, though that is not, like the other, peculiar to Matthew. After the flight which, on the arrest of Jesus, the two first Evangelists represent all his disciples as undertaking (Matt. xxvi. 56; Mark xiv. 50), we find indeed on the trial Peter as still present, but according to Matthew and Mark not one of the Twelve is to be seen at the cross; and when in Matthew (xxvi. 31) Jesus applies the prophecy of Zechariah (xiii. 7) to them, "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered," this expression appears to be quite correctly explained by the author of the fourth Gospel in the sense (xvi. 32) that the disciples will return to their home. In the fourth Gospel (taking the supplementary chapter into account) this return to Galilee takes place at the soonest eight days after the resurrection, and even in Matthew not until after they have heard of this and been directed to go there by Jesus. The latter appears to be a sort of palliative representation of the fact, attributing what was done voluntarily through fear to a higher command from Jesus himself.

But supposing the disciples, after the execution of Jesus, to have fled, in their first terror, to their homes, the reaction in their minds up to the point at which they might have visions of Christ, even though not absolutely unintelligible, in Jerusalem, is nevertheless far more capable of explanation. Outside of the range to which the power of the enemies and murderers of their Master extended, the spell of terror and consternation which had been laid upon their minds by his arrest and condemnation gave way. Moreover, in Galilee, in the regions which they had so often wandered through in his society, amid the population in company with whom they had so often been inspired by his words, they had every opportunity of

continually recalling his image to their minds, of realising it to themselves in the different important situations in which they had seen him there. Even the distance of the sepulchre is to be brought into consideration, the immediate neighbourhood of which, at least at first, would necessarily aggravate the difficulty of believing that he who had been buried there had quitted it. And if the transference of the appearances to Galilee disengages us from the third day as the period for the commencement of them, the longer time thus gained makes the reaction in the minds of the disciples more conceivable.

If, accordingly, as regards the locality of the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection, Matthew is in all probability right, it is easy also to see how it happened that subsequently injustice was done him, nay, that he did himself injustice, *i. e.* the last hand that touched up the older narrative worked upon by Matthew, by interpolating the appearance of Jesus before the women at Jerusalem. It was, of course, the most obvious thing for the imagination to represent the risen Lord as announcing his return to life, *i. e.* as appearing in the very place where he must have quitted the sepulchre. Moreover, the disciples, after they had recovered themselves in Galilee, and gained new faith in Jesus as the Messiah, had in fact returned to Jerusalem, and became here the founders of a church which, by reason of the central position of this city, soon became the centre of all the churches of the crucified and restored Messiah. How natural, then, that the time during which the Apostles retired from this central point should be willingly forgotten, and that the description of the course of events should take a turn implying that the metropolis had never been without a nucleus of a church, that the eleven had from the first continued together in Jerusalem, and that here too they had been awakened to renewed faith by the first appearances of their Master, after his resurrection! In this form the facts were stated at a later period in Jerusalem

in particular, and in this form represented by the author of the third Gospel, who enriched the Galilean tradition of the first principally by Jewish traditions and those of Jerusalem.* But it does not follow that it was from Galilean patriotism that Matthew made this country the theatre of the re-appearance of his risen Lord; but in the Galilean tradition which he followed there was simply no occasion to modify the original fact to the advantage of Jerusalem.

An unhistorical origin of the statement as to time, which lies at the foundation of the history of the resurrection, will be more difficult to admit than in the case of the locality of the appearances. The primeval definite account that Jesus rose on the third day, and was seen after having so risen, seems to have every claim to historical validity. But in this case also, when once the faith in his resurrection and in his having shewn himself after it was a given quantity, it may be discovered without difficulty why the third day exactly was fixed upon for the occurrence. It was necessary that death should have had power over the crucified Messiah for a short time only (comp. Acts ii. 24); his victory over death and hell must have been decided as early as possible. Thus, if the faith of his adherents had, on the one hand, a natural interest in placing the moment of his quitting the grave as close as possible to that of his death and burial, on the other hand, they did not choose to go so far that the element of this death should appear to vanish entirely: Jesus must have been only a short time dead, according to the body, but he must have been really dead. The endeavour to realise this notion was met by the circumstance that the crucifixion of Jesus, according to the unanimous account of all the Gospels, which is not affected by their discrepancy as regards the Feast of the Passover, had taken place on the day, and his interment on the evening, before the Sabbath. On the Sabbath, God had rested from all his works: how appropriate the idea which

* Comp. Köstlin, *Synoptic Gospels*, p. 230 ff.

represented the Messiah also as resting from the works of his human life over this very day, as only keeping the Sabbath rest in the grave! Add to this, that in consequence of the typical meaning of the number three, the third day seems to have been to a certain extent the proverbial limitation for a short time, as a period for the free execution or performance of anything. "Jehovah," say the repentant people in Hosea (vi. 2), "Jehovah will revive us after two days, and on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight." In like manner in Luke (xii. 32 ff.), Jesus orders Herod, that fox, be told, "Behold I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and on the third day I shall be perfected;" and also the fixing of the time in the deposition of the false witnesses (Matt. xxvi. 61), that Jesus undertook to destroy the Temple of God and in three days to build it up again, need not be derived from the history of the resurrection, as if it had not been said before. On the other hand, the continuance of Jonas in the belly of the whale, in which he offered a prayer (ii. 1—11) that may be compared with the Psalms relating to the passion of the Messiah, does not seem to have been brought in as a parallel case until later, subsequently, that is, to the time when the morning of Sunday had been fixed upon for the resurrection of Jesus (Matt. xii. 40). For the three days and three nights of that continuance do not agree with the two nights and one day, which, according to the evangelical narratives, Jesus passed in the sepulchre.

In this way the third day might have been fixed upon for the resurrection of Jesus, even in the lifetime of the Apostles, and have been adopted by them, even though it had no historical foundation. No one professed to have been an eye-witness of Jesus coming out of the grave; the time at which he did so rested solely upon inferences. The only certain inference was, that Jesus must have come out of the grave before he appeared to any one whomsoever. How

long before was left undecided ; and if on dogmatical grounds formed by prophecy, the day after the Sabbath, the third day, appeared particularly appropriate for this, one who had seen an appearance of Christ on the fourth or eighth day, or later, would have as little to urge against fixing on the third day for the resurrection as Paul, who did not see his until several years later.*

Thus the faith in Jesus as the Messiah, which by his violent death had received an apparently fatal shock, was subjectively restored, by the instrumentality of the mind, the power of imagination, and nervous excitement. A progressive life was now ensured for all that new and profound religious life that had been in Jesus, and by him, through teaching and example, imparted to his followers. But the imaginative form of this restoration continued thenceforth to give a standard according to which his figure was contemplated, his words, acts, and doctrines remembered ; his whole life was veiled in a shining cloud which continued to raise it more and more above the human element, but removed it in the same proportion from natural and historical truth. The history of the experiences also, which had founded the belief in his resurrection, suffered in this sense a modification, of which we shall speak at the conclusion of the second part of this work. It is the object of that second part to follow up in its particular features and changes that very modification which affected the history of the life of Jesus under the influence of the imaginative spirit of the most ancient Churches. That spirit was in many respects at the same time a relapse into ideas of the Judaizing period.

* Compare my Essay, quoted § 47.

END OF VOL. I.

C/SW
226/75

